

Vol. XXXIII

October, 1956

No. 4

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *From Jan., 1957, £1 per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. R. Donohoe, Hobart, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Dubbo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Bunbury—V. Rev. C. Cunningham, Dardanup, W.A.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithdown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—V. Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:

V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents :

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

- Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 291
- Apostolic Constitution regarding Religious subjects, their training
and their educators—Two books by Simone de Beauvoir condemned—
Patrons of Diocese of Bunbury.

JURIDICAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARISH PRIESTS AND CLERICAL RELIGIOUS, I,

- Rev. Thomas Connolly, D.C.L. 302

ST. JEROME ON THE INSPIRATION AND INERRANCY

- OF SCRIPTURE, Rev. William Dalton, S.J. 313

MARY, THE UNIVERSAL DISPENSER OF GRACES, II,

- Rev. Augustine Regan, C.S.S.R., S.T.D. 321

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY . . . Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D. 332

The Forgiveness of Sins.

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 338

Morality of medical hypnosis—Children of careless Catholics—
Obligation of the Missa pro populo.

CANON LAW Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L. 351

Impuberes and irregularities from Crime—Question concerning the
marriage of Vagi.

LITURGY Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 356

Shrine of Patron of a Church—Medal of Saint Benedict—Blessing
of the Green Scapular—Sancta Maria in Sabbato.

HOMILETICS Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 361

Christian Duty towards the civil government.

NOTES 367

Was William Bland converted? (R. A. Daly, B.A.)—Some Recent
Books (V. Rev. T. Veech).

BOOK REVIEWS 376

Patristic Homilies on the Gospels, Vol. I (Trans. Toal); *Ordina-
tion to the Priesthood* (Bligh); *Remembered in Blessing: The
Courtfield Story; A Seed That Grew* (Johnston); *The Mother of
God* (Philipon); *Saints and Ourselves* (Edit. Caraman) [p. 337];
Black Popes (Roberts) [p. 335]; *So Near is God* (Gillies)
[p. 366].

GENERAL INDEX FOR VOL. XXXIII 382

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Sydney, 1a die Octobris, 1956.

Official Documents

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

regarding Religious subjects, their training, and their educators

PIUS BISHOP

*Servant of the Servants of God
for a perpetual remembrance*

We look in the first place to the Seat of Wisdom, the Mother of the Lord God of all knowledge, and the Queen of Apostles, the Blessed Virgin Mary. To her honour We dedicated an entire holy year, and We can regard her as being in a special way the Mother and Mistress of those who, while embracing the states for the acquisition of perfection, likewise aspire to an apostolic life in the priesthood of Christ. The pursuit of such a vocation—religious, sacerdotal, apostolic—is a work of such magnitude, that for its efficacious realization, aspirants greatly need the guidance and help of her who has been appointed Mediatrix of all the graces that pertain to sanctification, and is rightly called the Mother and Queen of the Catholic priesthood and of the Catholic apostolate. We therefore earnestly supplicate her favour, that, as she has been for Us the Conciliatrix of light from above in framing these regulations, she may also show herself Auxiliatrix by her patronage towards those who shall have the duty of putting them in practice.

I.

By the gracious mercy of Divine Providence it has happened that, throughout the centuries, Christ the Redeemer has breathed into souls of His own predilection, as it were by an interior and mystic word, the same invitation which he once gave by His living voice to the rich young man: "Come, follow me." It has also happened that not a few, who heard that word and by the grace of God accepted it, leaving everything and following Him, became also, by a further choice of our Lord, "fishers of men" and "labourers sent into the Lord's vineyard."

This happens no less in our own day, when the union of religious profession with priestly dignity and apostolic ministry has become more frequent and closer. Indeed, in ancient days, Monks, for the most part, were not priests, only a few of them through necessity being compelled to accept the priesthood for the conversion of peoples to the Christian faith. These were, so to speak, drawn away from their Rule. Even

later, the Mendicants, though imbued with a wonderful apostolic spirit, were not all compelled by the Rule to be priests—St. Francis of Assisi himself was not a priest. The Canons Regular, on the contrary, and especially the Clerks Regular followed the divine vocation of the priesthood, receiving and exercising sacred orders. Subsequently, innumerable Congregations and Societies of the Common Life imitated them, as clerical institutes. To these are added in our own day, God so providing for the needs of each age, some secular Institutes which are also clerical.

Besides, at present, even in the older Orders of the Latin Church (those not formally called lay Orders) all the members, only those excepted who are known as coadjutors or conversi, are destined for the priesthood, and those who rule those same Orders must be priests.

Consequently, in our time, the Church enjoys a great host of ministers who give themselves both to the acquiring of perfection by the practice of the evangelical counsels and to the fulfilment of sacerdotal duties. They constitute the Religious or Regular Clergy, working side by side with the Secular or Diocesan Clergy, both performing their tasks vigorously, in fraternal emulation and in the spirit of mutual help, under one and the same supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff, with due respect to the power of the Bishops.

It will be clear to everybody that the Religious Clergy, in order to attain their double end properly and unerringly, do need very wise rules to guide and promote their formation, both religious and clerical.

This need has hitherto been met in large part by the constitutions and statutes of the various bodies, where these statutes lay down a method of training and a course of studies. There are, of course, also some regulations and recommendations of the Holy See. Nevertheless, the desire has long been felt to have some general ordinances duly set forth in order and more completely digested, resting on Apostolic Authority, and of universal observance. Surely such ordinances will do much to ensure the proper fulfilment of a work which is of such great importance for religion. They will place that work on a secure basis and help it to further developments and perfection.

A work which is so excellent really requires the constant vigilance of the Apostolic See, no less indeed than diocesan clerical schools which, as being public institutions in the Church, stand under its active care and perpetual control, such care and control being exercised by the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities. In just the same

way and by the same title, schools for the proper formation of those embracing the states of perfection, as recognised and sanctioned by the Church, are public institutions, and are subject to the authority of the Sacred Congregation of Religious.

For these several reasons We ratified, in 1944, by Our Apostolic Authority, the erection and constitution, within the Congregation for Religious, of a special Commission of competent men, which would study all the questions and matters that belong in any way to the religious and clerical education of aspirants and novices and juniors of any religious society of men living a common life, without vows. The Commission was to examine everything which belonged to the instruction of such candidates in letters and sciences and the practice of the ministry.

Composed of men from different Religious bodies and nations, this Commission had already examined all relative documents and gathered details of information from everywhere, in accordance with Circular Letters sent to the General Superiors, and had accumulated an immense dossier at the time that the general Congress of the States of perfection was convened, in 1950. Using various opportune proposals made during the Congress, the Commission reconsidered and revised its schemata, finally submitting them to Our approval.

Now, therefore, We are issuing a few Statutes, with a preamble of fundamental principles and rules, concerning the religious, clerical and apostolic formation of candidates. These principles and rules are to be kept in mind at all times by all concerned.

II.

The foundation of all religious life, either sacerdotal or apostolic, is what is known as a divine vocation. This, as everybody should know, consists of two essential elements, one divine and the other ecclesiastical. In regard to the first, it must be said that a vocation from God to enter the religious or sacerdotal state is so necessary that, if it is wanting, the whole foundation of the religious edifice is also wanting.

If God does not call, His grace does not move nor help the candidate. If, indeed, a vocation to any state must be regarded as divine in the sense that God Himself is the principal author of all states and all dispositions and gifts, whether these be natural or supernatural, how much more must this be true of religious and sacerdotal vocation which is so sublimely high and so inclusive of many endowments natural and

supernatural, that it cannot but "descend from the Father of lights from Whom every best and perfect gift comes?" (James 1: 17).

The second element of a religious and sacerdotal vocation follows the first, so that, as the Roman Catechism teaches: "Those are said to be called by God who are called by the lawful ministers of the Church."

The divine and the ecclesiastical vocations are intimately united, for the divine vocation to the religious and clerical state means that a person is destined to publicly lead a life of self-sanctification and to exercise a hierarchical ministry in the Church, which is a visible and hierarchical society. Consequently, this vocation must also be tested, admitted and controlled by those hierarchical rulers, to whom the government of the Church has been divinely committed.

All who are concerned with finding and testing vocations must constantly keep these truths in mind. They must never in any way force anyone to the sacerdotal or religious state, nor entice nor admit a subject who has not the signs of a divine vocation; similarly, they must not urge to the clerical ministry a person who shows that he has received only a religious vocation from God; neither must anyone push or pull to the secular clergy one who has the gift of religious vocation from God; lastly, no one should turn away from the sacerdotal state one who is known by certain signs to have been divinely called to it.

It is evident that in those, who aspire to clerical service in the state of perfection, and for whom these regulations are laid down, must have all those qualities which are required to constitute a religious, sacerdotal and apostolic vocation, not some of them, but all. Consequently, such endowments as are considered necessary for the fulfilment of the duties imposed by the divine call must be found in them.

III.

The germs of the divine vocation and the qualities required for the same need education and formation, in order to develop and attain maturity. Nothing is perfect at the moment of birth, but becomes perfect by degrees. In moderating this development all conditions of the person, as well as those of place and time, must be taken into account, in view of the effective attainment of the desired end. Hence the education of the junior aspirants must be carefully attended to. Their formation should be a sure formation, enlightened, solid, integral, and both wisely and courageously fitted to present-day needs, whether internal or external. It should be assiduously developed and watchfully

tested in view not only of the perfection of religious life but also that of sacerdotal and apostolic activity.

All these things, as experience teaches, can only be supplied by well-chosen men, who are not only eminent in learning and prudence and the discernment of spirits—who are not only distinguished for the variety of their experience of men and things and other human qualities—but are full of the Holy Spirit and that sanctity which will make them an example of virtue before the eyes of the young men. In the matter of education, certainly, virtue and exemplary life make a stronger appeal than words.

In this important task the first rule for the educators is that announced by our Lord in the Gospel, when He said: "I am the good shepherd, the good shepherd gives his life for his sheep . . . I am the good shepherd, and I know mine and mine know me" (Jn. 10). It is the same rule that is expressed by St. Bernard in these words: "Learn that you must be mothers of your subjects and not lords: strive rather to be loved than to be feared." (Sermon 23, on Canticle). The frequent exhortations of the Council of Trent to ecclesiastical Superiors are on the same note. The Council says: "The first admonition to Superiors is that they must remember that they are shepherds not tyrants, and that their prelacy is not a lordship over their subjects. They must love their subjects as children and younger brothers. They must endeavour by exhortation and warning to deter them from what is unlawful, lest, after faults have been committed, they may be compelled to inflict due punishment. If their subjects have, through human frailty, fallen into sin, the Superiors must observe the precept of the Apostle, which is to reprove, entreat, rebuke in all goodness and patience. Certainly, benevolence towards those who need correction is more efficacious than severity, exhortation is better than threatening, and charity accomplishes more than authority. If on account of the gravity of the sin, there is need of the rod, then rigour must be accompanied by meekness; justice must be tempered with mercy; severity must be sweetened by gentleness. Thus, without harshness, salutary and necessary discipline will be maintained amongst the people, those corrected will amend their ways, or, if they refuse to change, others by the salubrious example of their punishment, will be deterred from vices" (Conc. Trid. sess. XIII de ref. cap. 1).

Let all remember, moreover—all who in any way are set over the education of candidates—that this education and formation must follow

the way of organic progress, and be given according to an opportune method, with all the helps available. The whole man, under all the aspects of his vocation, must be envisaged, so that he may be totally formed into "a perfect man in Christ Jesus" (Col. 1: 28). As to ways and means and methods, it is manifest that those things which are based on nature itself and those things which are furnished by the human research of our time are, if good, not to be despised. Rather should they be highly esteemed and wisely used. However, no error could be more pernicious than that which would, in the formation of such chosen subjects, rely solely on those natural means, or even place too much reliance on them, to the neglect of the instruments and aids of the supernatural order. For the attainment of religious and clerical perfection, together with apostolic fruits, the supernatural aids, such as the sacraments, prayer, mortification, and others of this kind, are not only necessary, but primary and altogether essential.

While this order of means and works is observed, nothing should be neglected that helps in any way to the perfection of soul and body, to the cultivation of all the natural virtues, and to the virile formation of an integral humanity. The supernatural and religious or sacerdotal formation are thus founded on a solid foundation of natural honesty and cultivated humanity. The way to Christ is rendered easier and surer for men, when there appears in the priest "the goodness and kindness of God our Saviour" (Tit. 3: 4).

However, although the human and natural formation of the religious clergy is to be greatly valued, the first place in the course of formations belongs to the supernatural sanctification of the soul. The admonition of the Apostle pertains to every Christian: "This is the will of God, your sanctification," but how much more must not a priest and one who has publicly professed a life of evangelical perfection apply to himself the apostolic words. Besides, by his office he is made an instrument for the sanctification of others, and consequently from his own personal sanctity the salvation of souls and the increase of the kingdom of God depend in no small measure.

Let all who belong to the states of perfection remember and frequently meditate before God that it is not sufficient fulfilment of duty for them, if they avoid sins, either grave or, with God's help, venial sins also; it is not sufficient for them to carry out materially the precepts of Superiors; it is not sufficient even to observe vows or obligations of conscience, or their own constitutions, according to which (the Church

in its sacred canons so commanding) "all religious collectively and singly, both Superiors and subjects should dispose their life, to follow and strive after the perfection of their state." No, a literal fulfilment of all this is not sufficient, but they must do everything with a full soul and burning love, not only from necessity, but also for conscience sake. Really, the ascent to the heights of sanctity, and the opening up of living fountains of charity to all require from religious a most glowing charity towards God and neighbour, and the adornment of every virtue.

IV.

When provision has been made for such sanctification of the soul, a most accurate formation of the religious clergy in the intellectual and pastoral departments is also to be supplied. Of this, in view of the importance of the matter, We desire, in the consciousness of Our duty, to set forth the principles more fully, and recommend them.

The need of a solid and excellent intellectual education of the religious concerned emerges from the threefold dignity with which they shine in the Church of God, namely, religious, sacerdotal, and apostolic.

Religious men, on whom the duty rests of seeking God alone and, in loving adhesion to Him, contemplating divine things and giving them to others, must bear in mind that they can in no wise satisfy this holy requirement and unite themselves in sublime union with Christ, if they are destitute of that copious, profound and ever advancing knowledge of God and His mysteries, which is drawn from the fountains of sacred learning.

The sacerdotal dignity borne by him who is appointed an ambassador of the Lord of all knowledge and is especially called "the salt of the earth and the light of the world," demands a very full and solid training, in ecclesiastical subjects particularly, of such kind, namely, as can nourish and support the spiritual life of the priest himself and preserve him immune from every error and aberrant novelty. He must have the learning which will make him "a faithful dispenser of the mysteries of God" and "a perfect man of God, furnished for every good work" (I Cor. 4:1, I Tim. 3:17).

The apostolic office, which, according to the special vocation of each, the members of religious bodies exercise in the Church, by preaching, or instructing youth, or administering the Sacraments, especially that of penance, or giving missions, or directing souls, or in having daily contact with the people, will not be capable of producing abundant and

permanent fruits, unless they possess sacred learning in plenty and with the penetration that comes of study constantly kept up.

To ensure this solid intellectual education according to the natural progress of the young men and the orderly distribution of studies, the Superiors should employ every care that their religious subjects be so trained in letters and other subjects "as not to be inferior to those young men of the laity who are following the same courses. If this is secured, the way will be open for a more severe mental training, for the timely sorting out of the students according to ability," and for the preparation of the young men for their ecclesiastical studies.

In the fields of philosophical and theological learning the following observations hold. These subjects must be taught only by competent and carefully selected men. Everything enjoined by the sacred canons and by Our Predecessors and by Ourselves must be religiously observed. A fundamental requirement is due reverence for the Ecclesiastical Magisterium. Entire fidelity in regard to it is to be openly proclaimed and instilled into the minds and souls of the students. They are to be taught how prudence and caution must always accompany the diligent and commendable investigation of those new questions which arise with the progress of the times. All must be alive to the necessity of holding to the method, teachings, and principles of the Angelic Doctor, and of following his guidance in the philosophic and theological training of the students.

With Aquinas as guide and teacher, theology is to be taught according to a method at once positive and scholastic. Following the light of the authentic Magisterium, the sources of Divine Revelation are to be accurately scrutinized, with recourse to all those suitable helps that conduce to the clear exposition of the treasure of truth drawn from the sources and the efficacious defence of that truth. Since the deposit of Revelation has been entrusted solely to the Magisterium of the Church for authentic interpretation, it is to be faithfully explained not in a merely human way and by private judgment, but according to the sense and mind of the Church. Let the masters of Christian philosophy and theology, therefore, know that they do not teach in their own right and name, but in the name and by the authority of the Church, and therefore under the Church's watchful control. From her they have received a canonical mission and so, accordingly, they exercise their duties. Hence, due liberty of opinion being allowed in those matters which are still under dispute, "they must remember that they have not

received the faculty to teach, in order that they may communicate the spate of their own opinions to their students, but to impart to them the pure doctrines of the Church" (St. Pius X, *Motu proprio Doctoris Angelici*, 29 June, 1914).

Moreover, all, both masters and students, must keep in mind that ecclesiastical studies do not envisage intellectual training alone but aim at an integral and solid formation, whether religious or sacerdotal and apostolic. Hence they are not to be directed only to the passing of examinations, but to the impressing of a certain form on the minds of the students, a form which will never slip away, and from which, when practical occasions require, they can always draw light and strength for their own needs and the needs of others. (Pius XII, *ad Alumnos*, June 24, 1939).

To attain this, intellectual instruction must be closely associated with zeal for prayer and the contemplation of divine things. It must be full, no part of the prescribed subjects being omitted. It must also be coherent, forming a compact whole, so that all subjects will be so fitted together as to form one solid system. It should be wisely adapted, so as to supply the means of refuting the errors of our time and meeting the needs of our day. It should be au courant of modern findings and at the same time fully in line with venerable tradition. It should, finally, be directed to pastoral efficiency, so that the future priests may be able to set forth and defend sound doctrine in sermons and catechetical instructions, properly administer the sacraments, actively promote the good of souls, and be useful to everybody by word and work.

Undoubtedly, all that We have said about the spiritual and intellectual formation of the students is greatly calculated and altogether necessary for turning out truly apostolic men—for, if due sanctity and learning are wanting in a priest, everything is wanting—nevertheless, We shall not have satisfied the obligation of Our responsibility, unless We add something more. Besides sanctity and adequate knowledge, it is necessary that the priest who is to fulfil an apostolic ministry, should have a careful and complete pastoral preparation, such, namely, as confers skill and dexterity in the many kinds of activity demanded by the apostolic office.

If for the exercise of any art diligent preparation is a pre-requirement, such as consists in theoretical knowledge and technical skill acquired by long practice, a similar and even much more careful pre-

paration will be needed for pastoral work, which is deservedly called the art of arts.

This pastoral formation begins from the beginning of the course of studies ; it is perfected over the years of study ; and when the theological course is finished, it is crowned by a special period of exercise and probation. According to the special purpose of each institute, it ought to have this all-round aim: Those who are to be future ministers and apostles of Christ should be imbued with and practised in the spirit of Christ and the apostolic virtues, so as to be intimately penetrated by the mind of Christ. They should consequently have an ardent and most pure desire to promote the glory of God, an active and burning love for the Church to be shown in defending its rights and in keeping and spreading its doctrine, also an inflamed zeal for the salvation of souls. With these qualities should go a supernatural prudence in word and work joined to evangelical simplicity, a humble abnegation of self, and thorough subjection to Superiors, a firm confidence in God and a fine conscience in regard to duties. The apostolic ministry also requires a virile courage in undertaking the works of one's state, constancy in going on with them, a great soul prepared to suffer much and do much for God, and, lastly, a Christian amiability and humanity capable of drawing everybody.

Another aim of pastoral formation remains to be mentioned. According to the progress of studies, the students should be formed in all those branches which are conducive to the training of a completely "good soldier of Christ Jesus" and to supplying him with full apostolic armour. Hence there should be added to the philosophical and theological studies already mentioned a suitable initiation, under competent masters and according to the norms of the Apostolic See, in psychological and pedagogical matters, in didactic and catechetical methods, in social and pastoral science, and such like. This training should correspond to the modern progress of those sciences, and make the young men fit and ready to face all the multiple needs of our times.

In order that this doctrinal training and formation may be consolidated by use and practical experience, it should include graded exercises. Such experience We wish to be perfected specially in the final period of training directed by expert men, after the young candidates have been promoted to priesthood. Its solidity will also depend on the uninterrupted continuation of sacred studies throughout the years.

These general principles, whereby the said formation should be

carried out both by the teachers and those whom they teach, We decree with certain knowledge and with the fulness of Apostolic power as universal norms to be observed by everyone concerned. We also empower the Sacred Congregation of Religious to provide, by means of ordinances, instructions, declarations, interpretations and such like, for the effective working of the General Statutes approved by Us. The same Sacred Congregation is authorized to see to all things that regard the faithful observance of what is laid down in the Constitution and Statutes and Ordinances.

Everything to the contrary notwithstanding, even if worthy of special mention.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the thirty-first day of the month of May, feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Queen of the world, in the year of the Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six, the eighteenth of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

*

*

*

*

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE H.O.

Prohibition of Books,

Wednesday, June 27, 1956.

At a general meeting of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office the Eminent Cardinals entrusted with the safeguarding of faith and morals, having heard the judgment of Consultors, condemned and ordered to be inserted in the Index of Prohibited books the following works written by Simone de Beauvoir :

1. *Le deuxième sexe*, 2 vols. Gallimard, Paris, 1949;
2. *Les mandarins*, Gallimard, Paris, 1954.

In an Audience of the 30th of the same month and year the Holy Father confirmed the Decree and ordered its publication.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, July 12, 1956.

ARTHUR DE JORIO, *Notary*.

*

*

*

*

DIOCESE OF BUNBURY.

By Apostolic Letters, sub anulo Piscatoris, the Holy Father, at the petition of the Bishop, Dr. Launcelot Goody, has graciously deigned to constitute the Blessed Virgin Mary under the title "Help of Christians" primary Patron of the new diocese, and St. Patrick Pontiff and Confessor secondary Patron, with all liturgical honours and privileges that belong to Patrons of dioceses.

W. LEONARD.

Juridical Relationships Between Parish Priests and Clerical Religious

Introduction:

The care of souls is primarily entrusted to the parish priest, who is subject to the local Ordinary. At the same time, however, clerical religious have the right to exercise their ministry according to the norms of law. In the exercise of the sacred ministry both the parish priest and clerical religious enjoy certain rights and privileges. The parochial office throughout its historical development and in its present form has been and is given a unique and special place by reason of the reserved parochial functions. On the other hand, apart from the reserved parochial functions, the parish priest does not exercise an exclusive ministry. The religious, by reason of their life and institute to which they belong, have a special purpose and ministry approved by the Church. They, too, have a right to exercise the sacred ministry, especially in their churches, in accordance with the prescriptions of law. The juridical principles governing the relationships between parish priests and clerical religious are of the utmost importance since they govern and regulate the activity of both in carrying out the work of the sacred ministry.

Summary:

- Art. 1. The Parish Priest and his Relationship to the Ordinary
 - 1) Care of Souls
 - 2) Exercised in a Parish
 - 3) Under the Authority of the Ordinary
 - 4) Nature of Parochial Jurisdiction.
- Art. 2. The Parish Priest and his Relationship to the Internal Government of Religious Communities
 - 1) The Ordinary as Superior
 - 2) The Authority of the Parish Priest.
- Art. 3. The Activity of Religious in the Parish
 - 1) The Authority and Jurisdiction of the Ordinary
 - 2) The Authority of the Parish Priest.

THE NATURE OF THE PAROCHIAL OFFICE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO RELIGIOUS.

Art. 1—THE PARISH PRIEST AND HIS RELATIONSHIP TO THE LOCAL ORDINARY.

The Bishops are the successors of the Apostles and are placed by divine institution over individual churches, which they govern with ordinary power under the authority of the Roman Pontiff.¹ The Bishop enjoys the fullness of the priesthood which consists in the power to confirm, ordain, and consecrate, together with the other powers which he shares with priests in general.² In addition the Bishop has the right and duty to govern the diocese both in spiritual and temporal matters, and to this end he possesses legislative, juridical and coercive power.

¹C. 329.

²*Commentarium in Codicem Juris Canonici ad Usus scholarum.* Sac. Doct. Guidus Cocchi, C.M., 8 vols. in 5. Taurini MCMXLII. Liber II Pars I de Clericis in Specie, IV ed. 1937. p. 207 et seq.

which must be exercised according to the precepts of the sacred canons.³ The parish priests share in the authority of the Bishop, in a lesser degree, and represent for the faithful ecclesiastical authority.

The parish priest is an individual priest, or moral person, to whom a parish has been entrusted "in titulum" (with rightful possession) with the care of souls, to be exercised under the authority of the Ordinary.⁴ For the purpose of studying juridical relationships between parish priests and religious in the parish, three elements are to be considered in this definition: 1) care of souls, 2) to be exercised in a parish rightfully possessed, and 3) under the authority of the Ordinary.

1) Care of Souls.

In the Church, a society instituted by Christ for the salvation of souls, every faculty and office has for its object the care of souls. This care of souls can be complete or partial, according as it belongs to both the external and internal forum, or is restricted to the internal forum, sacramental and extra-sacramental.⁵

a) The parish priest does not possess jurisdiction in the external forum. Since the office is of ecclesiastical institution it is clear that such jurisdiction has not been given by divine law, as in the case of Bishops. Likewise this jurisdiction has not been granted by ecclesiastical law. Consequently the parish priest cannot judge in matters of faith,⁶ nor can he legislate, and impose penalties.⁷ By virtue of his

³C. 335.

⁴C. 451. See *The Pastor According to the New Code of Canon Law*. The Rev. P. Chas. Augustine, O.S.B., D.D., B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo., London W.C. 1923. Pastors pp. 35, 36.

⁵See c 196. *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*. P. Matthaeus Conte a Coronota O.F.M. Cap.—5 vols. Vol. I, 1950; Vol. II, 1948; Vol. III, 1948; Vol. IV, 1948; Vol. V, 1947. Taurini Marietti. Vol. I, p. 323.

⁶Prop. 9. Doctrina quae statuit, reformationem abusuum circa ecclesiasticam disciplinam in synodis diocesanis ab episcopo, et parochis aequaliter pendere, ac stabiliri debere: ac sine libertate decisionis indebitam fore subiectionem suggestionibus, et iussionibus episcoporum, falsa, temeraria, episcopalis auctoritatis laesiva, regiminis hierarchici subversiva, favens haeresi Arianæ a Calvino innovatae.

Prop. 10. Item doctrina qua parochi aliive sacerdotes in Synodo congregati prænuntiantur una cum episcopo iudices fidei et simul innuitur iudicium in causis fidei ipsis competere iure proprio. et quidem etiam per ordinationem accepto, falsa temeraria, ordinis hierarchici subversiva detrahans firmitati definitionem judiciorumve dogmaticorum Ecclesiae, ad minus erronea. Pius VI Constit. "Auctorem Fidei." 28th Aug., 1794. *Bullarii Romani Continuatio*, Benedicti XIV Opera Omnia 17 Vols., Prati 1832-1847, Clementi XIII... Pii VIII, 9 Vols., Prati, 1840-1854, III 2708.

⁷*Summa Iuris Canonici*, Cappello, 3 Vol. ed. IV, Romae 1945, Vol. 1, p. 457 and note 1. "Olim plures auctores docebant parochos competere facultatem casus reservandi. See Bened. XIV, *De Synod. dioec.*, lib. V, cap. 4, n. 2.

ordinary jurisdiction he cannot dispense from private vows.⁸

The ordinary power of the parish priest does not belong to the external forum. Jurisdiction in the external forum is immediately and directly concerned with securing the common good, and safeguarding the social rights and obligations of the faithful through the exercise of the public power of legislation, of judgment and coercion, and is only mediately and indirectly concerned with the individual good. In the internal forum this jurisdiction concerns personal obligations of conscience and the individual good. Thus, for example, it is an act of jurisdiction in the external forum to grant a dispensation from the vows of religion. On the other hand a confessor employs his power of jurisdiction in the internal forum when, by reason of special faculties granted to him, he dispenses a penitent from a private vow or from some hidden impediment to matrimony.⁹

The parish priest cannot dispense from the general or particular law of the Church unless this power has been expressly given him.¹⁰ This power is given in two canons. 1) Pastors may in special cases and for a good reason dispense individual persons or individual families, subject to their jurisdiction (even when they are outside their territory), and strangers whilst they stay in their territory, from the canon law regarding the observance of the Holydays of Obligation, of fast or abstinence, or even of fast and abstinence combined.¹¹ 2) In the circumstances mentioned in canon 1043,¹² but only in cases where the local Ordinary cannot be approached in time, the parish priest has the same faculties as those given to local Ordinaries in canon 1043.¹³ The parish priest enjoys certain faculties also in the case of urgency, when

⁸See C. 1313.

⁹*Religious Men and Women in the Code*, Jos. Creusen, S.J., 5th Eng. edition revised and edited by Adam C. Ellis, S.J., Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1953, p. 35.

¹⁰C. 83.

¹¹C. 1245, par. 1.

¹²In urgent danger of death the local Ordinaries can, for the sake of relieving a person's conscience and of rendering the offspring legitimate, if there be any, dispense from the form of the marriage contract as well as from any and all impediments of ecclesiastical law, public and occult as well as multiple, with the exception of the impediments arising from the sacred priesthood and from affinity in the direct line, if the marriage has been consummated. This dispensation may be granted to their own subjects wherever they may stay at the time, and to all who are actually within the territory of their jurisdiction. Scandal must be avoided, and, in case of dispensation from disparity of cult or mixed religion, the prescribed promises must be made.

¹³C. 1044.

everything is prepared for the marriage.¹⁴

In the external forum, however, the parish priest by virtue of his office, does enjoy certain powers not of a jurisdictional nature, preaching the Word of God, administering the Sacraments as the official representative of the Church to all who ask for them, celebrating the divine offices.

By virtue of his office the parish priest can give external and public precepts, v.g., a prohibition to marry in the case of an impediment. He must examine the parties before marriage. He must watch over the spiritual well-being of his flock and correct the erring. By reason of his canonical mission he exercises a public teaching office and a certain voluntary jurisdiction.¹⁵ In addition the parish priest has the right and obligation to administer and preserve the temporal good of his charge.¹⁶ Therefore the power of the parish priest, although it is not the true and perfect jurisdiction of the external forum, consists in a certain domestic and economic power over the parish, an imperfect society. This power includes both the jurisdiction of the internal forum and a true external administration both spiritual and temporal.¹⁷

b) The parish priest does possess true jurisdiction in the internal forum. This follows from the very nature of the office which is concerned with the care of souls and looks to the spiritual well-being of the individual. The Code states that parish priests, and those who take the place of parish priests, have ordinary jurisdiction to hear confessions in the whole territory over which their pastoral care extends. His power to dispense from the obligation of attendance at Mass on Sundays and Holydays and from the observance of fast and abstinence also pertain to the internal forum. The jurisdiction of the internal forum is both sacramental and extra-sacramental unless it is restricted to the sacramental. The administration of the Sacraments, preaching, teaching, paternal vigilance and all the pastoral activities of the parish

¹⁴C. 1045.

¹⁵"Item ex missione canonica exercent publicum magisterium et iurisdictionem quamdam voluntariam." *Ius Canonicum* auctore P. F.X. Wernz, S.J., ad Codicis Normam Exactum opera. Petri Vidal, S.J., Vol. II, Editio 3a, 1943. A.P. Philippo Aguirre, S.J., recognita, 7 vols. in 8. Romae, Vol. II, p. 927. See *CpR.*, Vol. XXXIV (1953), *De Potestate Dominativa in Religionibus non Exemptis*, J. Fuertes, p. 277.

¹⁶See *De Parocchia iuxta Codicem Iuris Canonici*, Rossi, Romae. Pustet, 1923, *Essentia Parochiatus*, n. 64 seq.

¹⁷Wernz-Vidal (*ibid.*) See *Summa*, vol. 1, p. 456. *De Parochi Jurisdictione. Institutiones Iuris Canonici*, Regatillo, Ed. IVa. Sal Terrae, 1951, 2 vols., vol. I, n. 602.

priest, so far as they affect conscience, belong also to the internal forum.¹⁸

This power of the internal forum, together with that true external spiritual and material administration constitutes the "care of souls" (*cura animarum*) which normally is to be exercised in a determined territory. The jurisdiction and power of the parish priest is ordinary in its nature, and not delegated. He obtains this partial or relative jurisdiction from the moment he takes possession of his parish.¹⁹ It is to be noted, however, that this ordinary jurisdiction of the parish priest cannot be delegated. This was stated in a reply of the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Code.²⁰

The term "jurisdiction of the parish priest" can be used in a strict sense and in a wide sense. In the strict sense it refers to the power of the internal forum. It is, however, often used in the wide sense. Canon 1230, par. 3, refers to a church of regulars, which is exempt from the jurisdiction of the parish priest, and canon 1368 states that a Seminary is exempt from the jurisdiction of the parish priest, in whose territory it is located. In these and similar cases the term "jurisdiction of the parish priest" indicates the complete power of the parish priest, his administrative power, his right to assist at the celebration of the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the faculties of both the internal and external forum, which belong to the office of parish priest by reason of common and special law.²¹

2) The office of parish priest is to be exercised in a parish right-fully possessed. The right to nominate and institute parish priests belongs to the Bishop, except for parishes reserved to the Holy See. All contrary customs impairing this right of the Bishop are disapproved. Those, however, who have been legitimately granted the privilege to elect or present the pastor, retain this right.²² Once the parish priest has been appointed and taken possession of his parish he assumes all the obligations and rights of the office and is the rightful parish priest.²³

3) *Under the authority of the Ordinary.*

¹⁸C.C. 873, 1245 par. 1, 202 pars. 1, 2. See Rossi, *o.c.*, p. 67 B.

¹⁹C. 461. See Wernz-Vidal. *ibid.* Vol. II, p. 926.

²⁰Resp. 16th Oct., 1919. *A.A.S.*, XI, 477.

²¹*Epitome Iuris Canonici*, Vermeersch-Creusen. 3 vols. Mechliniae-Romae. Dessain, 1949. I. Vol. II, n. 546, p. 407.

²²C. 455, par. 1. See also pars. 2, 3.

²³*A Commentary on the new Code of Canon Law*, Augustine C., 8 vols. B. Herder & Co., St. Louis and London, Vol. II, "Clergy and Hierarchy," 5th ed., 1928, comm. in C. 451.

The authority and jurisdiction of the parish priest cannot be arbitrarily taken away or limited by the Ordinary in such a way that it is de facto destroyed. This office belongs to the common law and the Ordinary possesses no power to abrogate it, except where this is expressly permitted. Nevertheless, because the Bishop retains immediate and ordinary jurisdiction over the whole diocese he can delegate another, even though the parish priest is unwilling, for single acts and functions.²⁴ He can exempt religious communities in the parish from the care and jurisdiction of the parish priest, even though they are not exempt by law and give them over to the care of another.²⁵ This exemption from the jurisdiction and power of the parish priest may also be acquired by legitimate custom or prescription.²⁶ Exemption from parochial jurisdiction granted by the Bishop could not be proved before the Code by any explicit text of law, and many canonists denied its possibility. The affirmative opinion was much more common towards the end of the period immediately prior to the Code.²⁷

With the Code the explicit statement of the Bishop's power is found in canon 464, par. 2. The juridical reason for this canon is that, although the parish priest has jurisdiction over the whole territory of his parish, he does not possess an acquired right, acknowledged by common law, to any particular part or portion of his parish. Otherwise all division and multiplication of parishes would become impossible.

The ecclesiastical functions reserved to the parish priest are enumerated in canon 462. The functions reserved to the parish priest, unless the law states otherwise, are the following: 1) to confer solemn Baptism, 2) to carry the Blessed Sacrament publicly to the sick within the parish, 3) to administer Holy Viaticum, whether publicly or privately, and to give Extreme Unction, due regard being paid to the prescriptions of canons 397, n. 3, 514, 848, par. 2, 938, par. 2, 4) to announce the ordinations of candidates from the parish and the marriage

²⁴See S.C.C., 14 Aug., 1863, *Fontes*, VI, 4195. See Rossi, *o.c.*, p. 72.

²⁵C. 464, par. 2.

²⁶S.R.R., 25 Feb., 1919; *A.A.S.*, XII, 129, *S.R. Rotae Decisiones*, Anno 1919; vol. XI, p. 47, Romae, 1926; *S.R.R.*, 29 Mar., 1915; *A.A.S.*, VII, 332, *S.R. Rotae Decisiones*, Anno 1915; vol. VII, p. 93, Romae, 1924; *Ius de Personis*, Chelodi, 3a. ed. curavit P. Ciprotti, Trento, 1942, p. 351.

²⁷*Ius Decretalium*, P.F.X. Wernz, S.J., Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Prop. Fidei Romae, Vol. II 1906, Vol. III 1908, II, p. 828; *Praelectiones de Locis Sacris*; Many, Parisiis, 1904, n. 172, p. 282; Chelodi, *ibid.*, p. 352. *S.R.R.*, 29 Mar., 1915; *A.A.S.*, VII, 332; *S.C.C.*, 21 Apr., 1917; *A.A.S.*, X, 138.

banns, and to assist at marriage and give the nuptial blessing, 5) to perform the funeral services of his parishioners in accordance with canon 1216, 6) to bless the houses of his parishioners on Holy Saturday or any other day according to local custom, with the blessing of the ritual, 7) to bless the baptismal font on Holy Saturday, to hold public processions outside the Church and to impart blessings, outside the church with great pomp and ceremony, unless in the case of a capitular church the Chapter performs such functions. The parish priest has the right to the revenue which legitimate custom or legal taxation grant him.²⁸

By virtue of his office, the parish priest is bound to exercise the care of souls over all who are not lawfully exempted from his jurisdiction.²⁹ His parishioners are designated by reason of domicile, quasi domicile, and the fact of actual residence for vagi and those who possess only a diocesan domicile or quasi domicile.³⁰

Art. II—THE PARISH PRIEST AND HIS RELATIONSHIP TO THE
INTERNAL GOVERNMENT OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

In law the local Ordinary, although listed as one of the external superiors of religious, is not described as a major superior, because his power is not formally an internal one. However, at times, many things are reserved to him which are of their nature internal. By reason of his ordinary power he must exercise vigilance over the superiors and their subjects and at times correct abuses and supply omissions of superiors.³¹

Exempt religious and nuns, who by their constitutions are subject to the jurisdiction of regular superiors of the First Order, are subject to the local Ordinary only in the cases expressly defined in law.³² The members of non-exempt institutes, approved by the Holy See, are subject to him as clerics, or as members of the faithful, but not as religious. They depend on their superiors for everything which has to do with religious discipline properly so called. In diocesan institutes, on the contrary, the religious as such depend upon the Bishop whom they have made a vow to obey.³³

²⁸C. 463, par. 1, See C. 1507.

²⁹C. 464, par. 1.

³⁰*Epitome*, I, n. 547, p. 407.

³¹See Larraone, *CpR*. V., 1924, p. 144, not. 93. See *De Religiosis ad Normam C.I.C.* P. Timotheus Schaefer, O.F.M. Cap., ed. 4a, Editrice "Apostolato Cattolico," Roma, 1947. p. 168, ch. 2.

³²C. 500, pars. 1 and 2.

³³Schaefer, *o.c.*, p. 171, Larraona, *CpR*. VI, 1925, p. 182, n. 74.

This dependence, nevertheless, is also limited by common law and by the approved constitutions of each diocesan institute. A diocesan institute is a moral person directed by its own superiors in conformity with the law. The Ordinary may not interfere with acts which deal with internal government and which are reserved by law, or the constitutions, to the superiors. He may not, for example, admit or dismiss either postulants, novices or professed religious, or command that a house be established, or assign duties to subjects. He may not appoint local superiors nor remove them from office.³⁴

Although the parish priest participates in the jurisdiction and authority of the Ordinary, the law does not grant him any share in the authority of the Ordinary with regard to religious. Consequently, the parish priest, apart from a special delegation, is in no way to be considered as an external superior similar to the Bishop. In the external forum he has no jurisdiction over superiors or communities of religious living in his parish. This is in conformity with the nature of the parochial office. The jurisdiction of the parish priest is restricted to the internal forum, with a certain external administrative authority.³⁵

The parish priest cannot interfere in any way with the internal regime of any religious community, whether pontifical or diocesan, exempt or non exempt. He has no power, for example, with regard to the changing of superiors, transfers of religious, the undertaking of a new work, etc. The communities must live and work according to the common law and their own constitutions approved by the Holy See.

Art. III—THE ACTIVITY OF RELIGIOUS IN THE PARISH.

In this article the relationship of the parish priest towards the activities of the religious in the parish must be considered. This activity includes the special purpose of the institute and the specific purpose for which the community has been founded in the parish together with all the activities by means of which these purposes are to be obtained. If, for example, the Vincentians have been asked by the Ordinary to open a school in a certain place, they will have to make contact with the Catholic parents of the district, and in the absence of government subsidy or support they will have to make appeals for funds in order to finance the undertaking. As is obvious, there is a possibility of trouble and friction with regard to the rights of the parish priest and the religious in these matters.

³⁴*Religious Men and Women*, Creusen, p. 41, No. 53.

³⁵ See *Care of Souls*, above.

The limits of the parish priest's authority with regard to the institute itself are very clearly defined. The parish priest cannot interfere in any way with the special work and aim of the institute, provided that in the foundation of the community all the prescriptions of law have been carried out. The parish priests, for example, have no authority to demand that this particular community of clerical religious should found and develop a work outside the scope of their constitutions.³⁶ The parish priest is in no way an internal superior and he cannot interfere with the internal discipline of the community and the carrying-out of its special purpose. At the same time he exercises a certain vigilance over the spiritual well-being of his parishioners, and in exercising this vigilance he at times must exercise certain prerogatives by at least bringing the matter to the notice of the Ordinary. Once more, to understand the nature of the parish priest's office in these matters, the nature of the Ordinary's jurisdiction must be first understood.

The local Ordinary has the right and duty to visit all hospitals, orphanages and other similar institutions destined for works of religion or for spiritual or temporal charity, even those which are erected as a legal person, and which enjoy exemption, no matter of what degree. Even though the pious foundation has not been created a legal person and has been entrusted to a religious community, the foundation is entirely subject to the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary, if the religious house belongs to a diocesan institute. If the religious in charge of the pious foundation belong to an institute of papal law, the foundation is subject to the supervision of the local Ordinary in all matters pertaining to the teaching of religion, moral conduct, exercises of piety and the administration of the Sacraments.³⁷

The Ordinary exercises the same power over schools.³⁸ They have the right, either personally or through others, to visit any schools, oratories, asylums, orphanages, or any other similar institute or house, to investigate all matters connected with religious and moral instruction. From this visitation no schools conducted by religious of any kind are exempt, unless there is question of a domestic school for the professed members of an exempt institute.³⁹ The question has been discussed whether, under the canon, the seminaries of exempt religious

³⁶See C. 497, par. 3.

³⁷CC. 1489-1491.

³⁸C. 1381

³⁹C. 1382.

in which boys are trained who have manifested their desire to enter the community later, are exempt from the Bishop's visitation concerning religious and moral teaching. The "Commentarium pro Religiosis" basing its arguments on the various drafts of canon 1382 and its final form as adopted in the Code, proves that these Minor Seminaries are not exempt.⁴⁰ In any case, because of the nature of the students, these Seminaries are not merely an internal affair of the community as such.⁴¹

The Church has committed to local Ordinaries the duty of seeing that the sacred canons on divine worship are faithfully observed and that abuses are eliminated. They should eradicate from private or public worship and from the daily lives of the faithful all superstitious practices and whatever is contrary to faith, out of harmony with ecclesiastical tradition, or has the appearance of sordid money making.⁴² If the local Ordinary publishes any laws and regulations for his territory concerning these matters, the exempt religious must obey them and the Ordinary may visit their churches and public oratories to see that they are carried out.⁴³

The parish priest represents the Ordinary in the parish and participates to a certain degree in the Ordinary's authority. He is responsible for the spiritual welfare of all his parishioners who are not legitimately exempt from his jurisdiction. In keeping with the nature of his jurisdiction and power—jurisdiction of the internal forum with its primary object the individual good together with the external offices of officially representing the Church and of administration under the authority of the local Ordinary—the parish priest has a similar obligation, although in a lesser degree, to that of the Ordinary. He must beware that nothing be done against faith or morals in his parish, especially in the schools whether private or public, and he must foster or institute the works of charity, faith and piety in his parish.⁴⁴ The extent and limits of his jurisdiction with regard to the various types of religious will be indicated by the common law and by the regulations of the local Ordinary in particular cases. Following the general principle that derogation from exemption in favour of the Ordinary does not mean that this authority is extended to the parish priest, it is clear

⁴⁰Cfr. vol. IV (1923), p. 224. Vol. XXIV (1943), p. 155.

⁴¹See Schaefer, *o.c.*, nn. 1282 and 1414.

⁴²C. 1261, p. 1. See *Exemption of Religious in Church Law*, Joseph D. O'Brien, S.J., S.T.D., J.C.D., Bruce, Milwaukee, 1943, p. 201.

⁴³C. 1261, par. 2.

⁴⁴C. 469.

that, unless special faculties are given to the parish priest by the Ordinary, he does not enjoy any rights of vigilance with regard to divine worship and the carrying out of the sacred offices in the churches and public oratories of exempt religious nor of visitation of their homes and undertakings.⁴⁵ In order that the parish priest lawfully exercise any such rights it is necessary that the Ordinary will have delegated him.

In the case of non-exempt clerical religious, and other religious who do come under the pastoral care of the parish priest, the parish priest has no power of jurisdiction (unless it has been granted) in investigating and correcting abuses in these matters. His obligation is to bring to the notice of the superior the defects and abuses which have arisen and to ask, by virtue of his public office, that the abuses and defects be remedied. If nothing is done by the superior the parish priest must place the matter before the Ordinary who will act, if he sees fit, to have the situation remedied.

(To be continued).

T. J. CONNOLLY.

⁴⁵See pp. 310, 311.

St. Jerome on the Inspiration and Inerrancy of Scripture¹

Summary: St. Jerome has no systematic teaching—The fact of inspiration—The nature of inspiration—Divine and human authors—Characteristics of the prophets and St. Paul—No attempt at reconciliation of two factors—The extent of inspiration—The inerrancy of the Scriptures—Practical difficulties—Classical expression of the traditional teaching—Misunderstandings of Jerome's teaching—St. Jerome and modern Biblical research.

ST. JEROME HAS NO SYSTEMATIC TEACHING.

It is not the writer's intention to give even a summary of *all* St. Jerome's teaching on inspiration; in particular, nothing shall be said on the very difficult question of his views about the canon of Scripture. The modern Catholic Scripture scholar cannot agree with the great Doctor on all points of his teaching; but in his general principles as well as in their concrete application there is an abundance of doctrine which can help to define and illuminate the great themes of Catholic tradition in the matter of Biblical inspiration. On the other hand, the great Stridonite, being a Scripture scholar rather than a dogmatic theologian, has left us with no systematic teaching on inspiration. His views are expressed occasionally and incompletely, implicitly more than explicitly, through the vast amount of his correspondence and scholarly works.²

THE FACT OF INSPIRATION.

The fact of inspiration, the divine nature of the Scripture, is a notion which underlies all that Jerome writes on the subject of the Bible. It is God who teaches in these sacred books, and the authority of the Bible is that of God Himself. The human writer is but the instrument of God, and the words of the Psalmist in Ps. 44, 'Lingua mea calamus scribae velociter scribentis,' are put by him into the mouths of all the sacred writers: 'Debeo et linguam meam quasi stilum et calamum prae-parare, ut per illam in corde et auribus audientium scribat Spiritus Sanctus. Meum est quasi organum praebere linguam, illius quasi per

¹This article is the substance of a talk given under the auspices of the Catholic Biblical Association on the 8th of September, 1955.

²The reader who seeks a full and scholarly account of St. Jerome's teaching on inspiration could not do better than to consult the excellent article 'on the Doctor in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique* (1947) under *Jerome*. A useful translation in English of his works is to be found in Vol. VI of *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, by W. H. Fremantle. This last, a Protestant work, is by no means free from considerable misunderstandings and anti-Catholic bias. The writer is indebted to both works, but particularly to the former.

organum sonare quae sua sunt.' (Letter 65).

The fact of the Scriptures' divine origin and nature comes out above all in the various terms which Jerome uses to describe them. Among many others we find: 'scriptura Dei, sermo divinus, scripturae coelestes, coelestis scripturarum panis. . . . 'In any case it is obvious that only profound faith in the inspired nature of the Bible can explain his life-long devotion, his enormous labours, his constant advice to priests and monks to read, study, meditate on the Scriptures, his belief that his life of study of the Scriptures was as pleasing to God as the pastoral activity of others. Any slight, real or imagined, on the honour he paid to the written Word of God was enough to draw from him a spirited reply, such as that of Letter 27 (which in Jerome's range of invective is in fact comparatively mild): 'Non adeo me hebetis fuisse cordis, et tam crassae rusticitatis, ut aliquid de dominicis verbis aut corrigendum putaverim, aut non divinitus inspiratum.'

THE NATURE OF INSPIRATION: DIVINE AUTHOR AND HUMAN AUTHORS.

When we come to the nature of inspiration, St. Jerome, like all others who have treated the question, is faced by the great paradox, that these books of the Bible are at the same time divine and human; while God is their author in the fullest sense of the word, they betray, often in a very striking way, their human origin as well. Jerome never loses sight of the divine element: he is almost scrupulous in bringing it into the foreground. So, in speaking of the book of *Isaia*s and the works of the other Biblical authors, he uses such expressions as: '*Isaiae, immo Domini per Isaia*m verba.' He makes clear that the fundamental value of any book of Scripture does not depend on the exact identification of the human author. Thus, in dealing with the Epistle to the Hebrews in Letter 129, he recalls the various views about its authorship, but concludes that it does not matter who the writer was, since it came to light in the bosom of the Church and has been accepted constantly as the word of God in Christian communities, and so has a divine guarantee of its inspiration.

When he comes to the human author, St. Jerome does not make the distinction between the function of a prophet and that of a sacred writer; this was not to be treated for many centuries to come. Modern theologians draw a clear line between the revelation a prophet receives and the charisma of inspiration in virtue of which he writes. The gifts of prophecy and inspiration are not merely distinct, but they are separ-

able; not all prophets were inspired to write, and not all sacred writers relied for their subject-matter on a divine revelation. However, once this lack of precision is allowed for, St. Jerome's remarks are very much to the point.

From all the sacred writers Jerome demands a high degree of holiness; he often refers to the writers of the Bible simply as 'sancti.' He notes that Isaias could not take on his office of prophet until he had been purified by the angel of the Lord. (Letter 18).

Against the Montanists, he insists that the sacred authors retained the full use of their faculties; and so the books they wrote could be properly ascribed to them. In this he was a faithful disciple of Origen and an opponent of Tertullian. In his prologue to the prophet Habacuc, he remarks with his usual force: 'Assumptio vel pondus prophetæ visio est, et adversus Montani dogma perversum intelligit quod videt, nec ut amens loquitur, nec in morem insanientium feminarum dat sine mente sonum.'

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPHETS AND ST. PAUL.

Not only does he reject the ecstasies which were the characteristic of pagan prophets, but he stressed the fact that each of the sacred writers retained his personality and revealed it unmistakably in his writings. He compares, literary expert that he is, the different styles of the prophets, Isaias the aristocrat, the eloquent city-dweller, Jeremias less refined, humbler in tone, as befits one who comes from the little Anathoth, Amos from the confines of the desert, speaking the language of shepherds, revealing of his style the solitude and the dangers of the shepherd's life.

Similarly, St. Jerome finds in the Epistles of St. Paul a revelation of the powerful personality and mobile temperament of the Apostle, in some ways much akin to his own. In a long letter to his friend Pamachius, (Letter 48) he justifies his own polemic against Jovinian by referring to his hero and model, Paul:

'I will only mention the Apostle Paul, whose words seem to me, as often as I hear them, to be not words but peals of thunder. Read his epistles, and especially those addressed to the Romans, to the Galatians, and to the Ephesians, in all of which he stands in the thick of the battle and you will see how skilful and how careful he is in the proofs which he draws from the Old Testament, and how warily he cloaks the object which he has in view. His words seem simplicity itself, and the expressions of a guileless and unso-

phisticated persons—one who has no skill either to plan a dilemma or to avoid it. Still, whichever way you look, they are thunderbolts. His pleading halts, yet he carries every point which he takes up. He turns his back upon his foe only to overcome him; he simulates flight, but only that he may slay...'

In this passage, we have a picture of the great controversialist revealing himself, and perhaps putting more of himself into St. Paul than he ought. But, for all that, it is clear that, in St. Jerome's mind, the sacred writers were no passive, impersonal instruments in the hand of God.

NO ATTEMPT AT RECONCILIATION OF THE TWO FACTORS.

We have, then, in the writings of St. Jerome the two poles of the doctrine of inspiration : the fact that God is the true and primary author of Sacred Scripture, and the second fact, equally important, that the sacred writers themselves remain authors in the full sense of the word. How reconcile two elements which at first sight seem mutually exclusive? This is something which we cannot expect from St. Jerome; only the theory of instrumental causality outlined by St. Thomas and applied by later scholars to the precise question of Biblical inspiration has succeeded in producing something like a satisfactory solution. However, from time to time in the writings of the Doctor we do see elements which later were to make for a solution. He insists that God's action on the prophet is internal: 'Vides quoniam Deus non in auribus, sed in corde loquitur.' (Tract. in Ps. 84) He declares that all the sacred writers are necessarily *theodidaktoi*, taught by God. In fact, Jerome describes so forcefully this intimate action of God on the mind of the inspired writer, that, if we did not have his express avowal to the contrary, we should think that he was falling into the Montanist error of depriving the human author of all real activity: the following is a typical expression: Apostolum, Spiritu Sancto plenum, repente in verba quae in se Christus loquebatur erupisse.' (Comm. in Eph.)

THE EXTENT OF INSPIRATION.

It must be admitted that St. Jerome's views on the Canon of the Old Testament were inconsistent; he admitted the accepted and traditional Canon in practice, but in theory he was so swayed by what he called *veritas Hebraica*, that he limited it to the Jewish collection of books. With this complicated question we are not dealing; but we may note that, apart from these erroneous ideas on the Canon, his doctrine

on the extent of inspiration is sound and traditional. To him all of the Scriptures, no matter what the subject matter is, is inspired. Thus he justifies the Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon, which some had rejected as being too slight and unimportant for divine inspiration. God, he says, who made the great things of the earth, made also the small, unless we are to put them down to the activity of the principle of evil, like Marcion. Similarly, the great and the small things of the Scriptures come from the same inspiration; even the slightest details, such as those about Paul's cloak left with Carpus at Troas (2 Tim. 6:13), are not excluded. Besides, who are we, he asks, to decide what is worthy of God or what is not worthy; God can show His wisdom under the simplest of forms. (Prologue to Philem.)

THE INERRANCY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

The inerrancy of the Scriptures has always been a dogma of Christian teaching, inherited from the Old Law, supposed and taught by Christ Himself and His Apostles, repeated and emphasised by the Fathers. Here St. Jerome is a tower of strength. No one of his day, and few since, could be more aware of the multitude and baffling nature of Scriptural difficulties; yet he never, *never* suggests the easy solution, that of calling Biblical inerrancy into question. This last for him is the necessary consequence of inspiration. Scripture is the word of God, and God must tell the truth, God cannot lie. A letter of his spiritual daughters, Paula and Eustochium, contains a sentence which certainly derives from their master and is worth quoting: 'Primum te scire volumus, omnem sanctam Scripturam non posse sibi esse contrariam, et maxime unum adversum se non discrepare librum, et, ut plus adjiciamus, eundem ejusdemque libri locum.'

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES.

This truth of Biblical inerrancy is maintained in theory, and also in practice, in the face of the difficulties themselves. Some of these arose spontaneously as Jerome grappled with the task of translating and commenting; others were sent to him by his friends for solution; others were thrown at the Church by its adversaries, Celsus, Julian the Apostate and others. Often he offers a solution which we can accept without reserves; on other occasions the solution has greater or less probability. Sometimes he is forced to reconsider the text, to see whether there has not been some corruption in the transmission of the passage. In a few desperate cases, he abandons the literal sense and takes refuge in the spiritual meaning, as for example in the celebrated

difficulty of Matt. 21:45, where Our Lord seems, according to the text, to enter Jerusalem mounted on two animals, an ass and its colt. The ass, suggests Jerome, is the synagogue, truly 'subjugalis,' under the yoke, while the colt represents the pagans, who have wandered, up to this point, free in the fields.

These difficulties, which caused him so much labour, and, as he says himself, so much anguish, ('*coepti mecum tacitus aestuare*') must shine now like jewels in his crown; or if difficulties do not shine, then at least the contemplation of their solutions must give him intense joy. For him the honour of the Word of God, the honour of the truth-telling God Himself, was to be defended with all his powers. When, on comparing the Books of Kings and Paralipomena, he came to the conclusion that the Bible affirmed that Solomon was a father at the age of eleven years, he preferred to accept this extraordinary exception to the laws of nature rather than to admit an error in the Scriptures. If we do not agree always with his particular conclusions, we must agree wholeheartedly with and extol his fundamental position, which is founded on the eternal truth.

CLASSICAL EXPRESSION OF THE TRADITIONAL TEACHING.

The classical expression of this teaching, strangely enough, was not formulated by St. Jerome, but by his friend and sincere admirer, the great Augustine. In a letter sent to St. Jerome, we read the following:

'I confess to you, my friend, that I have learnt to pay this respect and honour only to those books of the Scriptures which are called canonical, so that I most firmly believe that none of these authors has ever gone astray in his writings. But if I come across anything in these writings which seems to be against the truth, I have no hesitation in concluding either that the text is corrupt, or that the translator has not understood what was written, or that I have myself missed the meaning. And I am convinced, my brother, that you hold the same views.' (Letter 116).

MISUNDERSTANDINGS OF ST. JEROME'S TEACHING.

St. Jerome's general attitude to the inerrancy of the Scriptures is as clear as we could wish; yet there are a few passages in his commentaries which have been seized upon as a denial of this basic principle. An understanding of the text and context dissipates the difficulty in each case; and it would serve no useful purpose to deal with these passages here.

It is worth noting too that the supporters of an erroneous theory of Biblical interpretation called that of 'historical appearances,' claimed the support of St. Jerome. In this they were wrong, as Benedict XV pointed out in his encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitus*.

Faced with the apparent contradictions which arose between the Biblical narratives and the findings of archaeology and ancient history, they sought escape by maintaining that the writers of the Bible wished merely to pass on the views of their contemporaries and had no intention of describing the real course of events. The supporters of this view claimed that they were applying to *history* what was already acknowledged as a legitimate principle in interpreting the Biblical descriptions of the material universe. If the Bible sought merely to give us the appearances of things in the natural world, why not limit its scope in history also to that of appearances?

This theory, in actual fact, is diametrically opposed to St. Jerome's understanding of Biblical history, which tends if anything to be rigid and overliteral; it is based, as often happens, on the misunderstanding of certain texts, which are considered outside the greater context of his clearly expressed general principles. Again, it would be outside the scope of this short essay to deal more in detail with these passages. Let it be sufficient to note the misunderstanding and to vindicate the honour of the Doctor.

ST. JEROME AND MODERN BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

We can conclude our short study by bringing St. Jerome into relationship with the modern course of Biblical research. With St. Jerome, all Catholic scholars hold as a basis of discussion the doctrine of the absolute inerrancy of the Bible. Thus the Bible is always true in its meaning; but the obvious question then is: 'What does the Bible, in this particular passage, actually mean?' In other words, we must discover above all the literal sense of the passage.

St. Jerome always felt a strong attraction towards the spiritual sense of Scripture. In his earlier writings he passed too easily into subjective, unreal explanations, although he later condemned excesses in seeking for unfounded allegorical interpretations. Naturally, as his Biblical studies advanced, he came to see more and more clearly the necessity of establishing the literal sense as the foundation of all other investigations. Hence his long and arduous Hebrew studies, his interest in Biblical sites and places.

Acute critical scholar that he was, he would rejoice to see to-day

the profound study of the text of the Bible; he would rejoice too at the wealth of information about the ancient East, its literature, its religion, its life and customs; all this new knowledge throws strong light on the literal meaning of the inspired books. He would appreciate, too, the new and heavy responsibilities, the new difficulties, which this new knowledge brings with it. He would certainly praise, and in no measured terms, the fresh impetus given to the study of his beloved Bible by a new Damasus with his great encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. He would understand that now, as in his day, all legitimate Biblical studies must be based on these three great foundations: first, a realization that, as the Church gave the Bible to the world, so it has the right and duty to expound and defend it; second, an absolute acceptance of the doctrine of inspiration and inerrancy; and third, given the first two, a determination to spare no effort, to shirk no toil, to imitate even his own heroic labours in the ever deeper study of the written Word of God, *coelestis scripturarum panis*.

W. J. DALTON, S.J.

Mary, the Universal Dispenser of Graces, 11

Summary: Argument from Tradition (continued): Spiritual Writers and Theologians of the Middle Ages and Patristic Epoch.

III. Primitive Revelation: Scriptural instances of graces given through Mary. Scriptural teaching concerning her physical maternity of Christ, her consent to Incarnation, her holiness.

IV. From Implicit to Explicit: Introductory remarks.

(iii) *The Middle Ages:*

The current of Marian piety that honours the Mother of God as the dispensatrix of all graces, especially as we meet it in the unctious spirituality of the Berullean school, is in full continuity with the devotion to her characteristic of the ages of faith. The devotional literature of the Middle Ages is so full of Mary's power to give us what she wills and of her office as the channel of every good from God that any attempt to give any real idea of it must, in the space at our disposal, be necessarily most inadequate. We shall confine ourselves to quoting a few typical samples from preachers, spiritual writers and theologians.⁵⁵

(a) *Preachers:*

We shall mention two—both saints—one, *St. Bernardine of Siena*, who died in the middle of the fifteenth century, and the other, *St. Bernard*, who flourished some three hundred years earlier. In what both these great servants of Mary have to say of her mediation in the distribution of graces, we shall recognise the ideas and even the very phrasing already met with in later authors.

In a sermon on Mary's Nativity *St. Bernardine* has an oft quoted passage: "From the time the Blessed Virgin conceived the Word of God in her womb, she obtained, as it were, a certain jurisdiction or authority over every temporal procession of the Holy Spirit, so that no creature has ever received any grace from God save through the dispensation of His Mother".⁵⁶ *St. Bernard's* famous saying that God has willed us to have everything through Mary ("sic est voluntas eius, qui totum nos habere voluit per Mariam") occurs likewise in a sermon on

⁵⁵For the most part quotations are taken directly from "Florilegium Marianum" in Fr. Keuppens' "Compendium Mariologiae", under the heading "Documenta Sacrae Traditionis" (p. 166-220), where they may be found under the numbers indicated.

⁵⁶n. 356, cfr. "Le Glorie di Maria", capt. 5.1, p. 198.

⁵⁷PL 183, 441, n. 200.

Mary's Nativity.⁵⁷ Some other words of his are worth adding: "Through thee we have access to the Son, O blessed finder of grace, Mother of Salvation ("Genetrix vitae, mater salutis"): that He might receive us by thee, Who has been given to us by thee".⁵⁸

(a) *Spiritual Writers*:

Denis, the Carthusian, belonging to the fifteenth century, explicitly states: "God does not wish us to have any good thing which does not pass through the hands of Mary. Let us therefore recognise that we have received any good that is in us through her and let us thank her in God as our mediatrix".⁵⁹ The writings of *John Gerson*, Chancellor of the University of Paris, who died some fifty years before Denis, also abound in reference to Mary's universal dispensation of graces. He calls her the administress of God's bread and adds: "To thee, O most worthy Virgin, shall we turn, who by thy intercession can minister to us this good bread, which feeds and nourishes the soul".⁶⁰

(c) *Theologians*:

Mary's universal mediation in the distribution of graces receives little, if any, systematic treatment in the theological works of the Middle Ages,⁶¹ but its great theologians were well conversant with the doctrine, admitting it as unquestioned in their sermons, devotional works and commentaries on the Scripture.

Naturally it is of the highest interest and importance to know the thought of the Angel of the Schools, *St. Thomas Aquinas*, on Mary's role in the distribution of graces. As already implied, he gives no theological elaboration of the doctrine itself, though his teachings on the significance of Mary's divine maternity, her fullness of grace and especially her association with the Redemption through her consent to the Incarnation lays its theological foundations.⁶²

In his devotional and popular works, however, the Prince of Theologians shows himself a zealous partisan of the view of *St. Bernard* whom he quotes, obviously regarding it as part of the ordinary teaching and preaching of the Church. In his "*Expositio Super Salu-*

⁵⁸PL 183, 43, n. 201.

⁵⁹"*Expositio Ave Maris Stella*", *Op. minora* (Tournay, 1908), v 3, p. 84, n. 370.

⁶⁰Quoted by Fr. Bover, S.J., in *Gregorianum*, 1928, p. 266. See whole article—"Universalis B.M.V. Mediatio in Scriptis J. Gerson" (p. 242-268).

⁶¹cfr. Merkelback, O.P. "Quid senserit S. Thomas de mediatione B.M.V." in *Xenia Thomistica* (1925) (p. 505-530), p. 528.

⁶²cfr. Merkelback, l cit., also Hugon, O.P.; "S. Thomae doctrina de B.M.V. mediatrice omnium gratiarum" *ibid.*, p. 531-540).

tatione Angelica", written at the very end of his life, he undertakes to explain the meaning of the various titles with which Gabriel saluted Mary. We are told Mary is "full of grace" because it overflows her into all men ("Quantum ad refusionem in omnes homines"). "It is", he continues, "a great thing if a saint has enough grace for the salvation of many men: but it would be the very height of greatness—"hoc esset maximum"—if he had sufficient grace to save the whole human race, and this is actually the case with Christ and the Blessed Virgin. For in every danger you can obtain salvation from the glorious Virgin... Thus she is full of grace and is aptly called Mary, signifying enlightened in herself and illuminating others, indeed the whole world, and so she is compared to the sun and the moon".⁶³ A little further on he gives another interpretation to the name Mary—"stella maris": quia sicut per stellam maris navigantes diriguntur ad portum, ita Christiani diriguntur per Mariam ad gloriam".⁶⁴

St. Albert the Great likewise in his popular works constantly sings the praises of Mary through whom all graces come to us. Thus, in a sermon for the Feast of All Saints, he says: "The Blessed Virgin Mary receives beatitude from Christ and as a noble aqueduct conveys it to angels, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and all other saints".⁶⁵

St. Bonaventure speaks of Mary in a way that anticipates the very phrases of the Berullean school of a later age. "Those who place their roots in Mary are sanctified by her"⁶⁶ "Because she conceived Him Who is head of all the elect and whose members are those who are saved, of necessity she has for us a most universal charity and benevolence so that she loves all the elect with maternal affection".⁶⁷ Finally,

⁶³Opuscula Omnia (Ed. Mandonnet), v.iv (1927), p. 458.

⁶⁴1 cit., p. 459. Merkelback (p. 527-28) quotes a sermon on O. Lady's Nativity attributed to the Angelic Doctor in which are quoted the words of S. Bernard: Si quid est nobis virtutis, si quid salutis et gratiae, totum ab illa."

⁶⁵Keuppens, n. 263. On S. Luke 1, 28, S. Albert says of Mary: "Quae sicut canalis ad nos fluentia traducit gratiarum, quae ante omne tempus ad nos defluerunt" (n. 265). The well known "Mariale", hitherto attributed to St. Albert, abounds in reference to Mary's universal distribution of graces. Fr. A. Fries, C.S.S.R., has established, however, that the Saint did not write this work, but some later author at the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century (cfr. Laurentin, "Court Traité de Théologie Mariale (1954), p. 52, n. 48a.). Fr. Fries has published his findings in "Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philo. und. Theol. des Mittelalters", 1954, p. 5-80.

⁶⁶Sermon on the Purification (n. 230).

⁶⁷Sermon on the Nativity (n. 222).

he exhorts all to praise her before whom all knees bow, "since benefits flow from her to all".⁶⁸

No comment is needed on the above citations from one of the great saints and doctors of the Middle Ages and they could be multiplied indefinitely. Do they not clearly show how they, and the people whose faith they reflected and fostered, assumed as a basic principle of their devotion to the Mother of God that everything comes to us from God through her?

(iv) *Patristic Epoch*:⁶⁹

Naturally enough as we trace the stream of tradition back to its source, affirmations that Mary is, after Christ, the universal dispenser of grace are less explicit. Nevertheless there are many explicit testimonies, at least from the fourth century and, in any case, the Fathers who from that time speak of her intercession and power with God to do so with such clarity and emphasis that hardly anything else than a truly universal role in the distribution of grace can be supposed, especially as they attribute so many particular kinds of grace to her.⁷⁰ We can add that further critical research on the writings of the early centuries and examination of their doctrinal content confirm more and more every day, that for the early Church Mary was indeed the canal through which all graces came.

Confining ourselves to a few of the more explicit testimonies or those, at least, that more emphatically assert Mary's impetratory power we cite from the century before St. Bernard, *St. Peter Damien*. Addressing her in a sermon on her Nativity he says: "He that is mighty has done great things in thee and there is given to thee all power in heaven and earth".⁷¹ Again, we read in the same sermon: "In thy hands are the treasures of the Lord's mercies".⁷²

Three centuries earlier, the eighth, *St. John Damascene* places these words on Mary's lips: "Come all ye peoples with faith and draw most abundant gifts of grace. . . I have received the Source of Joy as my guest and I am overflowing with the delights of this perennial spring".⁷³ To the same century belongs *St. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople*,

⁶⁸Sermon on the Annunciation (n. 229).

⁶⁹See Keuppens (1. cit.), Bittremieux: "De Mediatione Universali", p. 203-211, and Livius, C.S.S.R.: "The Blessed Virgin in the First Six Centuries" (1893), ch. 5.

⁷⁰cfr. Bittremieux, 1 cit., p. 215.

⁷¹PL, 144, 740.

⁷²ibid.

⁷³In Dorm. B.M.V. Hom. PG. 96-746.

who has left us a passage quoted again and again in later times: "Thou, most chaste, most worthy and most merciful Lady, the solace of Christians, most prompt refuge of sinners, leave us not bereft of thy aid... Nobody obtains salvation, most holy one, except through thee. Nobody is delivered from evil except through thee... There is nobody to whom any gift of mercy is given, except through thee, most honoured Lady".⁷⁴

In the seventh century *St. Ildefonsus of Toledo* explicitly teaches that to be servants of the Son we must be servants of the Mother: "That her Son may rule me, I resolve to serve her... that I may be devoted to the services of the Son I earnestly desire to serve the One who bore Him".⁷⁵

In the fifth century *St. Cyril of Alexandria* renders strong testimony to our thesis by attributing all manner of graces to Mary: "Hail Mary, Mother of God, venerated treasure of the whole world;... through whom every creature... has come to the knowledge of truth; through whom believers have obtained baptism... through whom the nations are brought to penance... through whom the Apostles have preached salvation to the gentiles".⁷⁶ In the same century *St. Augustine* strongly, if implicitly, favours Mary's universal dispensation of graces by his well known doctrine that by bearing Christ she has, by her charity, also borne us who are the members of Christ's Body.⁷⁷ *St. Ambrose*, writing for virgins, proposes Mary as their supreme example, calling her "the spring of living water, the fount of virginity, the perfume of integrity, the odour of faith, a garden flowering with the grace of mercy".⁷⁸

In the fourth century, too, there is explicit testimony in another Doctor of the Church, *St. Ephrem*, whose writings superabound in the praise of Mary and celebrate her role as the dispenser of all graces. For him Mary is "the refuge of all even of the whole world". She is

⁷⁴Concio in S.M. zonam PG. 98, 378-79.

⁷⁵De Virg. Perpet. PL. 96, 108.

⁷⁶Hom. 4. PG 77, 991.

⁷⁷"Plane mater membrorum eius, quod sumus; quia cooperata est charitate ut fidelis in Ecclesia nascerentur, qui illius membra sunt: corpore vere ipsius capita nostri" (De Virginit—PL 40, 399). Fr. Congar, O.P., and others do not consider this and other patristic texts sometimes quoted establish any spiritual maternity of Mary as existing in the mind of their authors, except in the sense that all the faithful being members of the Church, mother of souls, share somehow in the Church's spiritual motherhood. cfr. Rev. des Sciences Philos. et Théologiques, Jan., 1954, p. 3-38, especially p. 33-34.

⁷⁸De Inst. Virg. PL 16, 326.

"the helper of the afflicted...the port in a storm, the support and receiver of all in necessity". To Mary he prays thus: "As long as I am in this most calamitous life, defend me, protect me, guard me: when I am on the sea be with me in the ship, be my companion in my voyage, protect me when asleep and direct all my ways". And again: "Lady, protect me under thy wings...I know not any other refuge".⁷⁹

Recent research has enabled us to produce an explicit testimony to the belief of the early Church in the power of Mary to obtain for us every grace, which expert opinion considers to date from not later than the third or fourth century. This is the discovery by M. C. H. Roberts of a papyrus fragment of Egyptian origin containing, practically as we know them now, the words in Greek of the prayer "Sub tuum", known the world over, wherever there is recited the Litany of Loreto or the Little Office of Our Lady, and preserved in various Eastern Liturgies.⁸⁰

Looking forward from the point at which we have now arrived till the time of St. Bernard we find, in general, this evolution in the thought of doctors and the belief of the faithful concerning Mary. First she is invoked as one having power with God to help us in every need and deliver us from all dangers ("Sub tuum"): then she is fervently and explicitly called upon as, under God, the source of every good (St. Ephrem, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Germanus), with a conscious connecting of her power with her dignity as Mother of Jesus Christ and her office in bringing Him into the world (St. Augustine). St. Bernard inaugurates the Middle Ages with the dialectical statement that God has arranged to give us everything through Mary. It is a beautiful example that "*lex orandi legem statuit credendi*".

PRIMITIVE REVELATION.

It should now be clear that the doctrine that Mary dispenses all graces must be founded on divine revelation, whether transmitted orally only to the primitive Church by Christ and the Apostles, or also con-signed to the inspired Scriptures. Was it explicitly revealed in the beginnings of the Christian Church or implicitly only, that is to say as contained in some other truth explicitly taught by the Apostles? Texts there are in the New Testament associating Mary with the giving of

⁷⁹Quotations are from the article of Fr. Bover, S.J.: "St. Ephraem Doctoris Syri Testimonia de universali B.M.V. Mediatione" (Ephem. Theol. Lov., 1927 (175, 177)).

⁸⁰See E. Druwe, S.J. "La Médiation Universelle de Maria" in "Maria Etudes sur La S. Vierge", vol. 1, p. 541-542 (edited by Du Manoir, S.J.); also ACR, July, 1955, p. 274-275.

grace, but if they are not clear or certain enough by themselves to justify us in attributing to her a universal role in its distribution, we must look elsewhere in Scripture and Tradition for some more general Marian truth, of which her universal intercessory role is a part, or from which, maybe, it is a necessary conclusion.

(I) *Graces given through Mary:*

Under this head one naturally thinks of the sanctification of John the Baptist at the sound of Mary's voice,⁸¹ the changing of water into wine at Mary's prayer at the marriage feast of Cana, that first miracle of Jesus whereby the faith of the disciples was confirmed,⁸² the association of Mary and St. John enjoined on them by Christ Himself from the Cross⁸³ and finally the presence of Mary in the Cenacle when the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles.⁸⁴

Each of these events in which Mary was associated has a special significance: the sanctification of the Precursor as the first wonder of grace wrought by the Word Incarnate, the miracle of Cana as His first prodigy of nature, the commendation of John to Mary from the Cross as a special guarantee of the Apostle's perseverance and the descent of the Holy Ghost as a treasure of grace given to the Church to last for all time and, in that way, containing every single grace ever to be given to its members. Between them they typify every kind of grace and so Mary's association with them might well typify her essential part in the distribution of all graces.⁸⁵ We might wonder, however, if we could really find such significance in the above incidents if we were not guided by later tradition or, at least, by what we read about Mary in other parts of the Sacred Scripture. Therefore, it does not seem reas-

⁸¹Lc. 1, 44.

⁸²Jn. 2, 1-11.

⁸³Jn. 19, 27.

⁸⁴Act 1, 14; 2, 1-14. For the first three texts cfr. Ceuppens, "Mariologia Biblica", p. 95-96, 177-187, 199-202, for the two Johannine ones Braun, O.P. "La Mère des Fideles" (1953), p. 49-47, 77-129, and for the Visitation F. Ogara: "De doctrina mariana in Visitationis mysterio contenta" in *Verbum Domini*, 1937, p. 200. A recent article interprets the Cana incident and Christ's apparent refusal in a way completely favourable to Mary's universal mediation (see *Dominican Studies*, 1954, p. 104-113).

⁸⁵Thus Bossuet in a Sermon on Mary's Conception magnificently develops the theme that Mary's part in the sanctification of John the Baptist signifies her part in our supernatural vocation, her role at Cana her role in our justification, and her relation to St. John the Apostle her part in our final perseverance ("Oeuvres", Vives, Paris, 1863, p. 44-48). Amongst theologians cfr. Hugon ("Tractatus Dogmatici", col. 2 (751.v), Roschini (Compendium, p. 298-301). See also the Encyclicals of Leo XIII, "Iucunda semper" (8 Sept., 1894) and "Augustissimae Virginis" (12 Sept., 1897) quoted by Roschini (p. 299, 300).

unable to claim any clear explicit revelation that all graces pass through her hands.

(II) *Implicit revelation:*

What then is the basic truth or what are the basic truths about Mary in the New Testament in which we can see the truth that she dispenses all graces? We shall find the answer by considering what, in summary fashion, New Testament revelation has to tell us of Mary herself and this can be expressed by saying that she is the Mother of the Redeemer, that she became so by freely consenting to the Divine Word taking flesh within her womb and that, in keeping with her high prerogatives, she is a person of incomparable sanctity.⁸⁶ Let us examine each point briefly.

(a) *Mary's physical maternity:*

The fact that Mary was physically the Mother of the Redeemer, that is, He took from her His Flesh and Blood, although conceived miraculously, needs no stressing, for nobody who accepts the Gospel even as reliable history has ever denied it. However, neither Catholic tradition nor the Scripture itself allows us to see in her wondrous maternity merely that she was a material channel through which God came into the world. Her maternity must be viewed in the light of the fact that she knew she was asked to be, and freely consented to become, the mother of the Redeemer, Who was the Word Incarnate.

(b) *Consent to the Redemptive Incarnation:*

A literal exegesis of St. Luke's account of the Annunciation leaves no doubt that, in the designs of Providence, the Redeemer was to come into the world through the free consent of the woman chosen to be His Mother.⁸⁷ Mary could not have failed to understand that the Son the angel Gabriel as the ambassador of God asked her to bear was the Messiah, for he described Him in formally Messianic terms: "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father: and He shall reign in the house of Jacob forever. And of His Kingdom there shall be no end".⁸⁸ Mary's "fiat" is obviously her free acceptance of the

⁸⁶For recent discussions on the fundamental principles of Mariology cfr. F. Connell, C.S.S.R. in "Marian Studies" (1950), p. 50-66.

⁸⁷The freedom of Mary's consent does not in any way mean God decreed the Incarnation only after having foreseen that Mary would accept the divine maternity, since He decreed her free consent in decreeing the Incarnation itself. (cfr. Billot, "De Verbo Incarnato" Thesis 41, p. 401: "habet si quidem Deus humanum cor in manu sua, et quocumque voluerit flectit illud").

⁸⁸Lc. 1, 32-33.

angel's proposition.⁸⁹ Thus she is unique amongst all the mothers of the world not only because of the infinite dignity of the One she bore, but also because, in freely consenting to bring into the world, One Whose mission and the general course of Whose future life she knew, she is the intelligent agent, under God, of all her Son was to do for the human race. Her consent, then, makes Mary a true, if secondary, source of Redemption itself, Gabriel himself saying as much when he told her "thou shalt call His Name Jesus",⁹⁰ the name indicating Saviour.

(c) *Mary's Incomparable Sanctity:*

The person whom God raised up to be His mother and who, in becoming His mother, becomes in a free and intelligent way the human source of the Redemptive Incarnation must be a person of unparalleled holiness. This conclusion is confirmed by the Scripture itself. Gabriel calls Mary "full of grace". Literally translated from the Greek, this expressions means—"embellished in a singular way"—for the angel uses it as though it were Mary's proper name, and he immediately says in what this singular favour consists, telling Mary that the Lord is with her. Obviously, then, her soul has been so adorned that, in a manner of speaking, she is worthy to be God's Mother and thus a source of grace to the world.⁹¹

Again, Mary's singular holiness is proclaimed through the mouth of her cousin Elizabeth, inspired by the Holy Ghost. Mary is "blessed amongst women", that is, according to the semitic idiom, most blessed of women—so blessed in fact that along with her Son she is separated from all other mortals, for she shares the blessedness of the Fruit of her womb. This necessarily means she has a holiness next to the holiness of her Son.⁹²

FROM IMPLICIT TO EXPLICIT.

From the primitive data that Mary, by her free consent, became the Mother of the Redeemer and thus the source of Redemption, having been prepared for this exalted role by the unparalleled holiness God conferred on her, let us now essay briefly to arrive at the truth the above

⁸⁹Ib. 38. Authors note that "fiat" translates the Greek optative (genoito) signifying desire and hence simple assent rather than obedience to a strict command. cfr. Bover, S.J.: "Deiparae Virginis Consensus" (Madrid, 1942), p. 16-31, for full discussion of text and context.

⁹⁰v. 31, cfr. Dillenschneider, C.S.S.R., "Marie au Service de Notre Redemption", p. 289-299.

⁹¹cfr. Ceuppens, O.P., loc. cit., p. 62-65.

⁹²Ceuppens, p. 95.

already holds in a general and confused way, that she is the dispenser of all graces. First, however, some few preliminary remarks are necessary to understand the import and process of development.

For the sake of convenience what we have just ascertained to be the explicit New Testament teaching about Mary's office and holiness will be taken as the point of departure of the evolution. Nevertheless, it is more than probable that the Apostolic Church's explicit faith concerning the part of God's Mother in our redemption and sanctification embraced more. This we say not only because of the not infrequent hints of the inspired word itself,⁹³ but also because oral tradition only is the primary and indispensable fount of faith. We must remember, too, that until her death Mary held an honoured place in the primitive Christian Church, St. John having taken her unto his own.⁹⁴ Who can say what treasures of Marian doctrine John did not draw from Mary herself and impart to the Church before the deposit of faith closed with his death?

Secondly, Marian dogmas are not abstract formulae but the manifestation of a person beloved most after Jesus Himself by Christians of all centuries. Therefore their meaning is not only a matter for logical analysis, but it is something to be understood in the warm light of filial love. Consequently reasons which in themselves have no more than a persuasive force can, in the concrete circumstances of the case, be true demonstrations, so that in later explicit beliefs concerning the power of Mary we may see true and certain developments of the primitive deposit, even though they do not follow from it with a quasi metaphysical or mathematical exactitude.⁹⁵

Thus, especially in the case of Marian dogma, there is much room for development by what Fr. Marin-Sola, O.P., has called the affective or experimental way, based on the understanding of the deposit by the *sensus christianus*, which according to the operation of the gift of wisdom experiences or tastes revealed truth—"ex quadam connaturalitate"—as the Angelic Doctor teaches⁹⁶ and as Pius XII himself has recently

⁹³For example, the presence of Mary on Calvary, her part in the sanctification of John the Baptist, etc., to say nothing of the probability that there is a literal allusion to her in the woman clothed with the sun in the Apocalypse (12, 1-18), cfr. Braun, p. 133-176; Leonard, ACR, Oct., 1954, p. 344-51.

⁹⁴Jn. 19-21.

⁹⁵cfr. G. Gillman, S.J., "Clergy Monthly", Jan.-Feb., 1954, p. 4-13.

⁹⁶2:2ae, q. 45, a. 4.

confirmed.⁹⁷ Hence what lovers of Mary "sense" to be true to her, at least if it is universally received by the faithful, is an excellent guide in investigating the evolution of the truths primitively and explicitly revealed about her.⁹⁸

It follows that the historical evolution of Marian doctrine need not coincide with its logical evolution, for logic does not condition the devotion of the faithful. Thus the Christian people could be very conscious that all graces come through Mary without more than a general and confused idea of her universal mediation, of which the former truth is a part and from which it depends; and this has probably happened. Naturally, too, different parts of the same basic truth will develop simultaneously in spite of a logical posteriority and priority between them; one will be found mixed up with another or will outstrip the other in speed of its development. Keeping these things in mind, we shall try to follow the evolution of the New Testament teaching about Mary mentioned above to the full doctrine of her universal mediation, in which we will see in proper perspective her universal intercessory role. In doing this in a concluding article we shall tend to follow, though not exclusively, a logical order of evolution.

(To be concluded.)

A. REGAN, C.S.S.R.

⁹⁷AAS (1950), p. 574. The Pope is careful to note that this affective approach does not replace reason or arbitrarily ignore it but rather helps it to a more certain and firm knowledge. cfr. Filograssi "De Ss. Eucharistia", p. 40-46.

⁹⁸For the whole question see Marin-Sola, "L'Evolution Homogene du Dogme Catholique", vol. 1, p. 353-392.

Dogmatic Theology

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS

As the great day of Resurrection was drawing to a close, Our Lord appeared to the apostles and conferred on them a majestic power. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them: whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained".¹ The communication of Christ's own mission, the conferring of the Holy Ghost and the clear meaning of the central phrases indicate that the apostles are given a divine power to forgive sins. Already, at the Last Supper, they had been given power over Christ's Sacramental Body; now, after the Resurrection, they are given power over the Mystical Body.

The main purpose of this article is to consider one aspect of the power of forgiveness—its universality. In the divine mandate itself the power entrusted to the Church has a universal amplitude. It extends to all sins without exception. But to be absolutely sure of our ground, it must be shown that this power is not restricted by any other text of Scripture.

There are certain passages in the New Testament which seem to contemplate an indirect restriction of the Church's power to forgive sin. They create the impression that God Himself does not pardon certain offences. Here, it is God who directly puts limits to his own mercy; but, as a result, the Church's power would be necessarily restricted.

THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

The question of unpardonable sins is raised by the severe condemnation which Christ uttered against the Pharisees. "Wherefore I say to you, every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven men, but blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. . . . Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this world or in the world to come".² There is a ring of finality about these words. They evoke the terrible picture of divine rejection, of an everlasting condemnation which is pronounced by God at the very moment of committing sin. Henceforth it is futile for the sinner to ask for forgiveness; it is like knocking at a door which will remain closed

¹John, 20, 21-23.

²Mathew, 12, 31-32.

forever. Before we jump to such conclusions, it is essential to determine the nature of the sin itself. What is the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost?

All his life St. Augustine hesitated before passing judgment. He suggested no less than six interpretations for the sin against the Spirit: final impenitence, despair, obduracy in evil, the deliberate rejection of the truth, presumption, envy. To reduce the blasphemy to final impenitence, or one of its equivalents, always remains an attractive solution. It explains perfectly why such a sin cannot be forgiven. The last breath of life is the decisive moment in which the soul's eternal destiny is sealed. But the evangelists themselves would suggest a different idea. The key to the problem lies in the gospel context.

In St. Mark's narrative the final condemnation is directly connected with the sin of the Pharisees. "Amen I say to you, all things shall be forgiven the sons of men, sins and whatsoever blasphemies they may utter; but whosoever blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit never hath forgiveness, but is guilty of an everlasting sin. Because they said, 'He hath an unclean spirit'."³ Here, the sentence of condemnation forms the conclusion of an argument by which Christ refutes the charge that he is possessed by an unclean spirit, and casts out devils by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of devils.

In the argument proposed by Christ, the sequence of thought is crystal clear, and the evangelists may be allowed to speak for themselves. "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan casteth out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then shall his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? They therefore, shall be your judges. But if I by the spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you. Or how can anyone enter the strong man's house and seize his goods, unless he first bind the strong man? Then indeed shall he plunder his house. He that is not with me is against me and he that gathereth not with me scattereth".

In the final analysis there are only two spiritual powers—the kingdom of God and the empire of Satan. The expulsion of the devil necessarily means the destruction of Satan's empire and the dawn of the messianic era. By casting out so many devils, Christ binds the once

³Mark, 3, 29-30.

strong man, and plunders his house and possessions. There is only one conclusion. The kingdom of God has come. He that is not with Christ, is against him.

Because they did not wish to adhere to Christ, the Pharisees ascribe his exorcisms to the spirit of evil, and choose to stand against him. The nature of their sin is well defined by the circumstances. The exorcisms of Christ are the manifest works of the Holy Spirit, for they are clearly accomplished by divine power. The Pharisees obstinately attribute good to evil. They associate Christ, the envoy of God, with the prince of darkness. They pervert the messianic mission of Christ. The blasphemy against the Spirit consists in attributing the manifest works of God to an unclean spirit. The motivating force behind the behaviour of the Pharisees is the perverse determination to reject Christ at all costs. This is the everlasting sin, the blasphemy which will not be forgiven.

We have now reached the very heart of the matter. In what sense is this sin unforgivable?

The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is unpardonable *from its own nature*. This sin is committed by those who refuse to adhere to Christ, attributing his manifestly divine works to Satan. Such a sin excludes every approach to God's mercy. It presumes a state of soul, a fixed outlook, which raises an insurmountable barrier between man and God. The sinner places himself outside the kingdom of heaven; he rejects Christ the very source of forgiveness and salvation. He chooses to remain in the state of sin, without remission, guilty of his sin for eternity. The blasphemy of the spirit involves a deliberate refusal to embrace the one means of salvation. Such a sin is unpardonable of its very nature; as long as it lasts, and precisely because it lasts, remission is impossible.

It might seem that the same reasoning applies to every mortal sin. No sinner can obtain forgiveness while he remains in the state of sin. Hence, in a sense, every sin is unpardonable. There is a certain amount of truth in this consideration; but it is only the blasphemy against the Spirit which has the special malice of making remission impossible. Other sins do not exclude the will to obtain forgiveness; they do not sever every bond between Christ and the soul. Even after sin there still remains faith and hope in Christ from whom forgiveness is obtained. But the sin against the Holy Spirit kills faith, which is the very germ of all spiritual restoration. While this mentality lasts, there can be no remission of sins.

To say that a sin is unforgivable of its nature does not mean that it is *absolutely* unpardonable. The power and mercy of God have no limits. The mercy of God is as universal as the value of the blood shed by Christ. There is no soul, no matter how hardened, which cannot be touched by divine grace. It is difficult to improve on the words of St. Thomas: "A disease is said to be incurable in respect of the nature of the disease, which removes whatever might be the means of cure, as when it takes away the power of nature, or causes loathing for food and medicine, although God is able to cure such a disease. So, too, the sin against the Holy Ghost is said to be unpardonable, by reason of its nature, insofar as it removes those things which are a means towards the pardon of sins. This does not, however, close the way to forgiveness and healing to an all-powerful and merciful God, who, sometimes, by a miracle, so to speak, restores spiritual health to such men".⁴

We conclude, therefore, that the sin against the Spirit is unpardonable, not absolutely, but from its own nature. The blasphemer is like a man who has condemned himself to death—reprieve is still possible if he turns to Christ. The obstacle to forgiveness lies not in God, but in the sinner. Hence the condemnation of the Pharisees does not in any way limit the power of the Church to forgive sins.

NO SACRIFICE FOR SIN.

In St. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews there are several passages where the Apostle seems to preach a gospel of despair. All hope of pardon seems to be extinguished. A typical example is found in the tenth chapter: "If we sin willingly after having received knowledge of the truth, there remains no further sacrifice for sin, but only a terrible expectation of judgment".

The deliberate sin which is here envisaged is no ordinary sin, but the complete abandonment of Christ by apostasy. We recognise the characteristics of this sin from the details supplied by St. Paul himself. It is an act which tramples underfoot the Son of God, which profanes the blood of the alliance in which man is sanctified, which insults the Spirit of grace. This sin severs every bond between the soul, Christ, and salvation. Faith and hope in Christ are completely dead.

This explains the finality of St. Paul's statement. For such a man there is no longer any sacrifice for sin. He has rejected Christ and his sacrifice, which is the one source of propitiation. The Christian economy is definitive and immutable. That is why the abandonment of

⁴11a 11ae, q.14, a.3.

Christ is an irreparable fault. To throw away the Christian heritage is to cast aside the divine means of salvation. It is futile to look elsewhere for substitutes. Outside of Christ there is neither a mediator nor a sacrifice for sin. Hence, if we sin willingly after receiving knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no further sacrifice for sin.

The theologian is not called upon to mitigate the severity of St. Paul's words. Every syllable accords with the Catholic doctrine of sin and repentance. The perspective of the Apostle is limited to the great sin of deliberate apostasy. He is not speaking of violations of the moral law in general. No limit is placed on the forgiveness of sinners who, despite all their faults, continue to believe in Christ. Even in regard to apostates, the apostle does not declare that God refuses to pardon such a sin. He simply indicates the terrible condition of those who abandon Christ. They are in a state of self-inflicted helplessness; they do not wish to be forgiven.

THE SIN UNTO DEATH.

In his first epistle, St. John makes a distinction between sins unto death and sins not unto death.⁵ This provided the Montanists with their famous distinction between remissible and irremissible sins. The Apostle does not invite the faithful to pray for those who sin unto death—an indication that such sins cannot be forgiven by the Church.

Once again, the sin unto death implies far more than a violation of the moral law. The death to which it leads is quite distinct from the loss of the life of grace. The precise nature of the sin can be determined only by examining the terminology of St. John.

In the Apocalypse he speaks of eternal death, second death, which is associated with disbelief, with the refusal to adhere to Christ. The same thought appears more clearly in his gospel. The man who believes in Christ does not perish, but has eternal life. He passes from death to life. On the contrary, the man who does not believe in Christ is already judged. A similar thought recurs in this epistle. Those who believe in the name of the Son of God have eternal life; those who do not believe have eternal death.

In the language of St. John, there is a spiritual death which is inflicted by refusal to believe in Christ. The sin unto death consists in the abandonment of Christ and the Christian community. The apostate cuts himself off from Christ and from those who pray with

⁵¹ John, 5, 16-17.

Christ. Hence he does not participate in the prayers of the Christian community. The Apostle does not forbid Christians to pray for apostates, implying that such prayers are futile, as though God had already decreed damnation.

Thus, wherever sacred scripture seems to limit the divine forgiveness, the appearances are deceptive. The sin against the Holy Ghost and the sin of apostasy are not absolutely unpardonable. The power which Christ gave to the Church has no limitations. It is universal in extent.

C. TIERNEY.

*

*

*

*

SAINTS AND OURSELVES (Second Series), edited by Philip Caraman, S.J. (London: Hollis & Carter. 1955. 149 pp. 18/9. Copy from Burns Oates, Melbourne.)

Twelve English Catholic writers have each contributed a chapter to this book, thus dealing in all with twelve saints. Some readers may know the names of all the contributors, though some are newcomers, comparatively, to Catholic journalism. There is now an Old Guard comprising the bright spirits of a few years ago. Chief of these are: Christopher Dawson, E. I. Watkin, D. B. Wyndham Lewis and Reginald Dingle. We regret that Death has taken Sherwood Taylor in the midst of his intellectual apostolate; his study on St. Albert the Great shows what Catholic letters have lost.

The only newcomer among the saints is St. Nicholas von Flue, and even he is not new if one counts the years of heavenly citizenship. He died in 1487, and if human beings can judge of such matters at all, he must have, by now, been for some centuries with the saints in heaven. Yet he was not canonized until 1947. E. I. Watkin, who writes of him here, explains the delay in a matter-of-fact style: "There was no influential Order to push the cause of a layman; no Catholic ruler, and the process was held up by technical breaches of canon law." The cultus of Nicholas was not sanctioned by the Holy See until the reign of Pope Clement IX in 1668. This, says Watkin, was "equivalent beatification." Surely that is a debatable statement.

Admirers of Vincent Cronin's books will be glad to see his name appended to the study of St. Jeanne de Chantal, and his spiritual insight which leads him to appreciate the fine lines that make up an etching of her character. He quotes with something like tenderness her advice for the getting of wisdom: "Be humble, gentle and submissive."

M.O.

Moral Theology

MORALITY OF MEDICAL HYPNOSIS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A friend, who is a member of the medical profession, has requested guidance on the morality of the application of hypnosis in the treatment of suitable cases. He claims that its use can be beneficial with certain nervous conditions, and in conditions in which nervous tension often plays a part. He is also anxious to know if there would be any objection to its use in childbirth. Perhaps you could help by a treatment of the question in your next issue.

PASTOR.

REPLY.

Theologians commonly teach that the use of hypnosis may be lawful for some medical purposes, if proper safeguards are observed.¹ A temporary loss of consciousness, which varies with the degree of the hypnosis, is necessarily associated with its use. Further, the subject is under an influence of the hypnotist, and is susceptible to his suggestions. The suspension of the use of the rational faculties may be justified for the good of the whole body, or, as we say, for medical purposes. The need for special safeguards is evident, when the responsibility for one's acts is surrendered to the will of another. Precautions should be taken also against possible harmful after-effects.

¹Noldin (*Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 1954, vol. II, n. 749) holds that hypnosis is *per se* unlawful, though it may be lawfully used for medical purposes, and perhaps for the promotion of scientific knowledge, under certain conditions. Genicot (*Institutiones Theol. Moralis*, 1946, vol. I, n. 273) condemns the use of hypnotism for the purpose of seeking effects which certainly transcend the order of nature, but acquits of the sin of superstition a person who employs it for effects within the natural sphere, even if they are unusual, provided they are wrought by medical men or scientists. Prummer (*Manuale Theologiae Moralis*, 1935, vol. II, n. 523) states as a principle that hypnotism, *per se*, is not unlawful, though it may become so, because of abuses. Aertneys-Damen (*Theologia Moralis*, 1947, vol. I, n. 432) admit the natural explanation of what is called *Hypnotismus scientificus*, and allow that it may be employed under proper conditions. Cf. also Merkelbach (*Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 1946, vol. II, n. 348) who stresses the need for great caution because of possible abuses; Vermeersch (*Theologiae Moralis*, 1928; vol. II, n. 325); Antonelli (*Medicina Pastoralis*, 1909, vol. II, p. 51). This author gives at length the arguments of Fr. Cononier, O.P., who defends his doctrines from arguments drawn from St. Thomas. D'Annibale (*Summula Theologia Moralis*, 1908, Pars II, nn. 38-54) gives a rather extensive treatment of the subject with numerous references to the literature then available. Pujiula, S.J. (*De Medicina Pastoralis*, Marietti, 1948, nn. 249-255) has a concise exposition of the various aspects of hypnotism.

The terms: animal magnetism, mesmerism and hypnotism are used by the older authors as more or less synonymous.² They are different names for an artificially induced mental state, which we will describe presently in greater detail. The mesmerists or defenders of animal magnetism differ from the supporters of hypnotism mainly in their theories as to the causes of the same abnormal state with its various stages of drowsiness, rigidity, unconsciousness, somnambulism, amnesia and automatic obedience. To many these words suggest the intervention of the devil, to others deliberate fraud and intentional deceit, or, at best, an unusual method of amusement at the expense of the weak-minded who are not averse to making a public exhibition. Unfortunately, there may be some historical foundation for these notions, which do not coincide with the genuine concept of hypnotism, as used by conscientious medical men.

Animal magnetism was first taught by Frederick Anthony Mesmer (1734-1815), an Austrian physician, who propounded the system later to be called after him. He considered that a subtle fluid, due to the influence of the planets, and like the magnetic force exerted by some bodies, emanated from all animals—hence the name ‘animal magnetism.’ By means of this fluid, a state resembling sleep, usually accompanied by insensibility to pain and rigidity, could be induced by an influence exercised by the operator over the will and nervous system of the patient. It was thought to be a cure for bodily ills, and first came into prominence as an adjunct to medicine; though before long it seems to have fallen into the hands of charlatans, and became mixed with practices plainly superstitious. The medical profession in general did not receive the use of animal magnetism with enthusiasm, and the Faculty of Medicine at Paris censured it in 1774, with the note: *civium saluti, bonis moribus et facultatibus obstrusas moliri insidias*.³ For some years prior to 1840, it was given doubtful acceptance in the Parisian hospitals, but in that year it was banned entirely by the Medical Faculty, and its use forbidden. Its extinction did not follow, for it still had a large number of devotees, some sincere and learned, others deserving neither of these appellations. About this time, the questions concerning animal magnetism came under the notice of the Roman authorities, who condemned not the thing itself, but its abuses.⁴

²Antonelli. Op. cit., p. 14, note.

³Quoted by D’Annibale, vol. II, p. 30 (4).

⁴Holy Office, 23rd June, 1840; S. Congregat. of the Inquisition, 21st April, 1841; 15th May, 1841; 4th August, 1856.

About the same period, Dr. James Braid (1795? - 1860)⁵, a physician of Manchester, England, became interested in the alleged phenomena associated with the mesmerists. At first sceptical as to their claims, he was forced to the conclusion that they could not be all summarily dismissed, and sought to study their causes. In 1842 he advanced the theory that certain phenomena of abnormal sleep and a peculiar condition of mind and body might be self-induced by a fixed gaze at an inanimate object, the mental attention being concentrated on the act. This, he asserted, proved the subjective or personal nature of the influence and that it did not come from some magnetic influence passing from the operator to the patient, as was held by the mesmerists. He called this artificial condition 'neuro-hypnotism,' a name which became abbreviated to the now familiar 'hypnotism'. He used hypnotism for the treatment of ailments, including hysteria and certain forms of paralysis, and defended his theories against the mesmerists throughout his life. The efforts of Dr. Braid to restore hypnosis to its place as a means of healing met with support on the Continent, especially at Nancy and Paris. Dr. Charcot, of the Paris School, in the seventies of the last century, attributed hypnosis to a malady of the nervous system—hysteria. The use of hypnosis as a form of treatment did not seem to meet with general favour. The Manuals of Moral Theology, which deal with it, admit (most of them) that its use is lawful under certain conditions, but even those published within the last decade or so, often add that medical opinion questions its advantages⁶. In a recent article entitled "Respectable Hypnosis" appearing under the name of Richard Asher, M.D., F.R.C.S., in the *British Medical Journal* (11th February, 1956), the prevailing attitude to it is thus expressed: "Physicians use it little; psychiatrists largely spurn it since it was rejected by Freud; and it has tended to become the province of the riffraff of medicine, the sport of music halls, and a popular item on television." There are indications of a swing in its favour, and the article of Dr. Asher is a plea for its acceptance as a reasonable form of treatment in certain selected cases.

"Hypnosis is a state of exaggerated suggestibility, produced by

⁵Dictionary of National Biography, vol. II, p. 1106.

⁶For example Prummer. l.c. A recentioribus medicis magis ac magis in dubium vocantur salutare effectus hynotismi, saltem si producit usque ad somnambulismum. Etenim nunc satis constat, effectus salutare obtentos per hynotismum esse saepe brevis durationis, postea autem morbum apparenter curatum redire, et quidem in gradu vehementiori.

suggestion and fixing of attention." Such is Dr. Asher's definition; and he is unwilling to be more precise, lest he should enter the regions of improbability or indulge in mere words. Antonelli⁷ defined it fifty years ago as "Sleep, or a state resembling sleep, wherein the spiritual faculties of the person hypnotised are under the influence and direction of the hypnotiser, whose spoken suggestions are obeyed." It would seem to be a state resembling sleep, artificially produced, wherein the suggestibility of the patient is increased and his mental faculties depend for their operation on the word of the hypnotist. There is no reason to postulate the intervention of agents of a higher order to explain either the causes or effects of true hypnotism.

The cause, as is now generally agreed, is suggestion, for which the patient is prepared by fixing his attention on a sensible object, usually by looking fixedly at some source of light. No claim is made by the advocates of therapeutic hypnosis that influences beyond the order of nature are at work. The means employed: surroundings conducive to sleep, silence, relaxation of the body, mental attention on a single object of one sense, the suggestion of drowsiness, are commonplace enough and contain nothing of the occult or preternatural. How hypnosis results from such influences is not altogether clear, but it is well known that close attention to one thing can blot out advertence to all else. A state of abstraction is not uncommon in persons who have the gift of applying their minds undividedly to one object. They are referred to as absent-minded, but their faculties are really so concentrated on the matter which absorbs them that they are oblivious to everything else. To their friends they may be an occasion of anxiety and to themselves a source of embarrassment, but there is nothing in their behaviour requiring more than a natural explanation. The patient under hypnosis is oblivious of everything except the person who has hypnotised him, and all his actions are prompted and governed through this one contact with the outer world.

One who is opposed to the suggestions of the hypnotist will not succumb to his influence. Some cannot be hypnotised at all: it has been estimated that only something like two out of every five persons can be deeply hypnotised. Nor is it a sign of weak will or of a disposition to hysteria to be easily hypno-

⁷Op. cit., n. 18. *Somnus vel status somno similis in quo hypnotizati facultates spirituales sub actione et directione sunt hypnotizantis, cui obedit per suggestionem oralem.*

tisable. "My experience," writes Dr. Asher, "is that normal intelligent people make the best subjects for hypnosis." One possible explanation that comes to mind is that they can more easily fix their attention and thus dispose themselves for the hypnotic sleep. "There are many grades of depth (in hypnosis), and some subjects experience only slight drowsiness and are not properly hypnotised. I use the term 'deep hypnosis' only when amnesia and somnambulism can be produced, and the term 'light' when paralysis or rigidity occurs but without amnesia. On this classification," states Dr. Asher, "the degree of hypnosis in the first 50 consecutive cases attending my clinic was: deep, 20; slight, 20; slight or none, 10."

Hypnosis may be considered as a temporary exaggeration of certain mental activities (and a suspension of others) brought about by natural means which experience has taught are suitable for the purpose. We may distinguish two elements: the state of sleep (or something akin to it) and an exaggerated suggestibility. Neither of these demand more than is inherent in human nature. It is true that hypnosis is not the same as ordinary sleep. One proof is that sleeping people do not obey commands implicitly as do those who are under hypnosis. Nevertheless the loss of consciousness does not exceed what may happen naturally in conditions other than sleep, as in hysteria and catalepsy. Dreams and illusions are frequent enough in natural sleep and show that some of the mental faculties may function during a state of unconsciousness. The hypnotised patient is susceptible of suggestions, communicated to him through the senses, usually the sense of hearing, by the only person with whom he is in contact. In every-day life, we adopt the suggestion of others, often without being aware that they have such influence over us. In curing disease, suggestion can sometimes do more than medicine, as those who care for the sick can testify. In the hypnotic state, the degree of natural suggestibility is exaggerated, but capable of a rational explanation.

Striking results can be obtained under deep hypnosis. The phenomena which may be induced include: "paralysis, rigidity, anaesthesia, automatic obedience, delusions, somnambulistie trance, post-hypnotic suggestion and post-hypnotic amnesia."⁸ Dr. Asher writes: "Under deep hypnosis the subject automatically obeys any suggestions made by the hypnotist; for instance, if you suggest that he cannot move

⁸Asher in *British Medical Journal*, 11th Feb., 1956, p. 309.

he is virtually paralysed, but if you suggest that he can move, then he does so. Hypnosis is in fact what you make it . . . The phenomena are what you and the patient have put there, not clear-cut entities like the stages of anaesthesia." The phenomena which may occur while under hypnosis may be explained by the dependence of the patient on the hypnotist; while the putting into effect of suggestions after the hypnosis has passed, and of which the subject has no memory, may be due to the image which has been impressed and fixed in his subconscious mind, and at a given time will emerge and prompt him to action. Though the phenomena associated with hypnosis may be unusual, it is fairly agreed that they are effects for which we need not go beyond the workings of the natural faculties to find an adequate explanation.

The suspicion of superstition, long attached to hypnotism, may have its origin in the fact that animal magnetism (as it was known) was more or less allied with spiritualism, in the hands of the unscrupulous. It was claimed that phenomena, some of them clearly above the order of nature: infused knowledge of difficult sciences and of unknown languages, communication with absent persons, second sight, etc., were produced by animal magnetism. It was also claimed that magnetism was the explanation of miracles and events which hitherto had been ascribed to divine intervention. The spiritualistic and superstitious additions to magnetism were worthy of censure, and were actually condemned by the Church. In the year 1840 (the year of the condemnation of mesmerism by the Medical Faculty of Paris) and the following year, there were three replies of the Roman Congregations on the matter. The first of these was an answer of the Holy Office (23rd June, 1840) to the question:

Should magnetism, considered in general and in itself, be judged lawful or not? The reply was:

Consult the approved authors, with this observation that where all error, divination, and explicit or implicit calling on the devil is absent, the mere act of employing physical means otherwise lawful is not forbidden, provided they do not tend to any unlawful or sinful purpose. But the application of principles and merely physical means to explain physically things and effects which are really supernatural is nothing but unlawful and heretical deception.⁹

On 21st April, 1841, the S. Congregation of the Inquisition was consulted not merely about magnetism in general, but on some of the circumstances which often accompany it: the magnetised person, who is

⁹Quoted by Ballerini-Palmieri, 1899, vol. II, n. 366. A similar reply was given on 28th July, 1847. *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* n. 1018.

evidently uneducated, acts as one most learned, an illiterate reads Arabic script and letters which are sealed, without even using his eyes; he obeys the magnetiser, although he is several leagues distant from him, and other things of the same kind which could not be accounted for as natural effects. Further, the magnetism frequently takes place when persons of both sexes are present, not without grave danger to morality. The answer did not condemn magnetism, but ran:

Usum magnetismi, prout exponitur, non licere.¹⁰

A similar reply was sent to the Bishop of Lausanne on 15th May of the same year, in answer to a long letter in which the abuses of magnetism are set forth in some detail. The magnetised person is frequently a woman, who under the somnambulistic trance is capable of giving answers to extraordinary questions on medicine, the identification and acts of absent persons, etc., and on coming out of the trance, has no recollection of what has happened. One is tempted to suspect fraud on the part of the hypnotiser, or there may be room for diabolic intervention. At any rate this method of practising magnetism was condemned.¹¹

Some years later (4th August, 1856) a circular letter of the Congregation of the Inquisition to all the Bishops drew their attention to the abuses of magnetism.¹²

It is well known that a new kind of superstition has been introduced with the phenomena of magnetism, whereby many innovators do not devote themselves to investigating the physical sciences, as would be right, but strive rather to deceive and seduce men, claiming that things hidden, remote and future can be discovered by the art and tricks of magnetism, especially by the help of a woman who depends entirely on the will of the magnetizer.

After drawing attention to former replies of the Holy See, given in particular instances, the Letter continues:

. . . The malice of men has gone so far that, neglecting the lawful study of science, and rather following curiosity, with great danger to souls and evil to civil society, they boast they have discovered some principle of prophecy and divination. Hence they pretend that by the deceits of somnambulism and clear sight, as they are called, received by a woman in the midst of gesticulations not always modest, they can see the unknown and receive knowledge even about religious matters, and presume rashly to manifest things unknown or far away, and indulge in such-like superstitions, while the woman in question makes handsome profits for herself and her masters by foretelling the future with certainty. In all these affairs, irrespective of what art or fraud they employ, there is contained unlawful and heretical deception and scandal, harmful to honesty and morality.

The Bishops are enjoined to repress these abuses by all means in

¹⁰Quoted by Ballerini-Palmieri. *ibidem*.

¹¹*Ibidem*.

¹²Collectanea, n. 1128.

their power, even by the infliction of canonical penalties on the guilty "so that the flock of Christ may be defended against wicked men, the deposit of faith kept safe and intact and the faithful preserved from moral corruption." Again we note the object of the condemnation was the abuse and not the legitimate and scientific use of magnetism.

Not until the lapse of over forty years did the subject of magnetism or hypnotism again receive the attention of the Roman authorities. In 1899 (26th July) a reply of the Holy Office to a medical doctor stated that, provided there were no danger of superstition or scandal, it was lawful to take part in those experiments of hypnotism which were already known; with regard to the future, where it was certain that the facts did exceed the powers of nature, it was unlawful; and in case of doubt, it could be tolerated after a protestation against all preternatural happenings, care being taken to avoid scandal.

If the scientific use of hypnotism is not evil, we may ask: can it be availed of for medical treatment? Three things are to be considered: the loss of consciousness and self-responsibility, the dependence on the will of the hypnotist and possible after-effects.

a) Loss of consciousness and of the use of our rational faculties occurs naturally every day in sleep, to which we willingly and lawfully succumb. The artificial deprivation of our higher faculties, even for a time, could not be permitted without weighty reasons, but can certainly be justified when the good of the whole body requires it. If the use of an anaesthetic to save the pain of a surgical operation is accepted without question, subjection to hypnotism may be judged, in this respect, according to the same principles. The first condition for the lawful use of hypnosis in medical practice is that the health of the patient requires it. When a competent and conscientious medical man concludes that hypnosis is a suitable and efficacious remedy for certain conditions, we may accept his assurance that it is for the benefit and general health of his patient. As the rational faculties are man's most precious natural gift, hypnosis should not be resorted to unless there is no other remedy at hand which gives at least equal promise of the same beneficial results. In this, it may be compared with the administration of drugs which interfere with the mental processes, or the giving of 'shock treatment.' We may note with emphasis that entertainment value is not a justification for hypnotism, any more than it would justify drunkenness or any other temporary deprivation of the use of reason. We would consider it a serious sin to subject a person to a

long and deep hypnosis except for a medical or other really serious reason.

b) The patient is, to a greater or less degree, dependent on the hypnotist and susceptible to his suggestions. It seems certain that in a light hypnosis he will not accept a suggestion to which he has a strong conscientious objection; but in deep hypnosis it is not so clear that he could not be induced to do something contrary to his moral code, even after he was awakened. Consequently, there must be proper safeguards as to the character of the hypnotist and the suggestions he conveys. The presence of a third person to protect the interests of the patient may overcome this difficulty, where prudence suggests.

c) Possible after-effects are neurosis of some kind and a facility to be hypnotised again. The competence and experience of the hypnotist would be an assurance that this danger would be avoided, or at least capable of correction should it occur. The physician would also be bound to make sure that hypnosis had passed before he allowed the patient to undertake his own care again.

Finally, it should be noted that the patient, or whoever is responsible for him, if he be a minor, should be informed of the nature of the treatment, and the proper consent obtained.

We would conclude that hypnosis may be used for medical purposes, with the consent of the patient, when such treatment is required in the judgment of a conscientious physician, with proper safeguards against abuse of the hypnotist's influence during the hypnosis, and precautions against harmful after-effects.

Our correspondent's friend is concerned about the use of hypnosis in childbirth. There are two main objections: one that the pains of labour are a punishment for sin, and should be endured, and the other that emotional indifference of the mother towards the child is likely to result. The first objection has been well answered in the recent address of the Holy Father to a group of Doctors of the International Secretariat of Catholic Doctors:¹³

In Genesis we read "In pain shall you bring forth children" (Gen. 3/16).

In order to understand this saying correctly, it is necessary to consider the condemnation passed by God in the whole of its context.

In inflicting this punishment on our first parents and their descendants, God did not wish to forbid and did not forbid men to seek after and make use of all the riches of creation; to make progress step by step in culture; to make life more bearable and better; to lighten the burden of work and fatigue, pain, sickness and death, in a word to subdue the earth (Gen. 1/23).

¹³A.A.S., a. 1956, pp. 90, 91.

Similarly in punishing Eve, God did not wish to forbid—nor did He forbid—mothers to make use of means which render childbirth easier and less painful.

One must not seek subterfuges for the words of Sacred Scripture. They remain true in the sense intended and expressed by the Creator, namely: motherhood will give the mother much suffering to bear.

In what precise manner did God conceive this chastisement and how will He carry it out? Sacred Scripture does not say.

Regarded as a means of overcoming the pains of childbirth, hypnosis can scarcely be more against the moral law than anaesthesia induced by any other means, provided the precautions are taken which we have already stressed for the lawful use of hypnosis.

The harm to the bonds of motherly affection by the use of hypnosis in childbirth was referred to by the Holy Father in the Address just quoted wherein he harkened back to a former Address given on 29th September, 1949, to those who took part in the fourth International Congress of Catholic Doctors, held in Rome at that time.¹⁴ He explains that he had in mind

a procedure then used in the maternity hospital of a great modern city: in order to avoid pain for the mother, she was plunged into a deep hypnosis, but it was noted that this procedure resulted in emotional indifference toward the child. Others, however, believe that this fact can be otherwise explained.

In the light of this experiment, care was taken subsequently to waken the mother several times during labour for a few moments each time; in this way the effect feared was successfully avoided. An analogous verification was made during a prolonged narcosis.

It would seem that the want of affection between the mother and a child born during hypnosis is not to be ascribed with certainty to the hypnotic state of the mother; and even if it be so, there are ways and means of avoiding it. These ways are not available if the mother is subjected to an anaesthetic from which she cannot be awakened, till the effect of the narcotic wears off. Some diminution of affection of the mother for her child is an effect which could be permitted, if otherwise the parturition would be dangerous to the life of either mother or child.

* * * *

CHILDREN OF CARELESS CATHOLICS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In a certain parish a number of children attending the parochial school have parents who seldom fulfil their religious duties. Would it be right for the pastor, with a view to preserving sacred things from desecration, to refuse admittance to the school to all children whose parents do not go regularly to Mass?

DOUBTFUL.

¹⁴A.A.S., a. 1949, p. 557.

REPLY.

The principle of saving sacred things from desecration has no application in the present case. Further, the neglect of one duty—regular attendance at Mass—is no reason why careless parents should be prevented from fulfilling another obligation—the sending of their children to a Catholic school. It would appear that these unfortunate children have more need of the instruction and good example of the Religious teachers than have those whose parents are exemplary.

Where is the desecration of things sacred in teaching ignorant children the truths of our holy Faith and showing them how to lead a Catholic life? It would be a sweeping statement, not necessarily true, and proved by experience in some cases to be actually false, that they will unlearn at home all they have been taught at school. There is always the hope that, having learned the Christian Doctrine in childhood, they will remain faithful to it; and even if the probability of their future defection were high, at least they know how to return to God, should they receive the grace of repentance. An instructed though careless Catholic has the means of salvation at his disposal, and, if he so desires, can save his soul. He may be a 'practical' pagan, but deprived of instruction he would be such in theory also, and his eternal salvation beyond his attainment. Our Lord charged His Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature (Mk. 16/15); and we must not forget that there will always be good and bad in the Church. The Christian Revelation was to be given to all, not merely to those who would make good use of it. Christ preached to the people who were to reject Him.

The obligation of hearing Mass every Sunday is imposed by can. 1248 of the Code, and is of ecclesiastical origin. The obligation of not exposing the faith to danger in schools which are non-Catholic mixed or neutral (can. 1374) has its basis in the natural law. It would be a strange procedure to adopt if a pastor were to place his parishioners in the occasion of violating the natural law in order to spur them to keep one which is of lesser importance. Though careless in one respect, these parents have some regard for their duties as parents. Why should they be asked to make the choice of "all or nothing"? It would seem more reasonable to be grateful that things are not worse and use every endeavour to make them better.

The school exists to help the parents in the training of their children; and the more the parents are in actual need of help, the greater is the reason for the aid given by the teachers in school. Admission to a

Catholic school is not a reward for parental virtue; it is a helpful and sometimes necessary means to train the children to know and love God. Children of good Catholics would most likely follow their parents' instruction and example, without the aid of any school. It is with the children from careless homes that the Catholic school has an opportunity of exercising the apostolate.

In conclusion, we would remark that the exclusion of children from the benefits of Catholic education because of the shortcomings of their parents is a penalty which the children have not deserved—they have committed no crime. As baptized Catholics, they have a right, *ceteris paribus*, to be treated the same as other children of the parish, and the pastor who would exclude them, merely because their parents do not attend Mass regularly, would act beyond the sphere of his competency.

*

*

*

*

OBLIGATION OF THE *MISSA PRO POPULO*.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A Parish Priest, who is lawfully impeded, arranges for another priest to offer the *Missa pro populo* for him. By mutual arrangement, the celebrant of the Mass accepts no stipend. Could he apply one of his Sunday Masses, by reason of fidelity or charity towards the pastor, as the *Missa pro populo* and satisfy the obligation of a stipend at the second Mass? Would the intention of the pastor to remunerate the priest who offers the Mass enter into the question?

CASUS IUSTITIAE.

REPLY.

The application of the *Missa pro populo* is always the discharge of an obligation in justice, and so the celebrant cannot take a stipend for another Mass which he may celebrate on the same day, except on the Feast of Christmas.

The pastor is bound, by reason of a quasi-contract with his people, to exercise his priestly office on their behalf. As the offering of the holy Sacrifice is the first of all priestly ministrations, he engages to celebrate for his people, according to the dispositions of the Church's laws. He thus undertakes an obligation towards them, which is based on an implied contract, and so binds in justice. It is a personal obligation (*tenetur parochus . . .*);¹⁵ but if he is unable to fulfill it himself, he must have the Mass offered by some other priest. The law itself

¹⁵Can. 466.

gives him the option, when he is legitimately absent from his parish, to offer the Mass in the place where he is, or to entrust the fulfilment of the obligation to the priest who takes his place in the parish.¹⁶ The object of the obligation is the celebration and application of the Mass; and for this the pastor is responsible. The people have a right to the Mass. If the pastor is the celebrant, he fulfills the obligation personally; when another priest offers the Mass, the pastor's obligation is discharged *per alium*. In either case, the application of the *Missa pro populo* satisfies an obligation in justice towards the people.

Is the question any different if the celebrant applies the Mass merely to oblige the pastor, accepting no stipend? The arrangement between the pastor and another priest is altogether extrinsic to the fulfilling of the debt towards the people. The two priests may agree on a basis of justice, fidelity or any other virtue possible, but the application of the Mass still remains what it was—an act of justice. The celebrant undertakes to offer a Mass which the pastor was bound to offer, or at least have offered, for the people. This would prevent him from fulfilling another obligation in justice on the same day.¹⁷

JAMES MADDEN.

¹⁶Can. 466, par. 5.

¹⁷Can. 824, par. 2.

Canon Law

IMPUBERES AND IRREGULARITIES FROM CRIME.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I am encouraged by the article on irregularities to ordination which was published in this year's April issue of the *A.C.R.* to submit a question affecting the incurrance of irregularities. I have a particular case in mind, but I prefer to submit the question in a general form and would be grateful if it could be discussed in that way. The question is: Can irregularities from crime be contracted by boys who have not yet attained the age of puberty? Does it not seem that canon 2230 at least leaves the way open for the opinion that they would not incur such irregularities?

A.B.C.

REPLY.

In effect our correspondent is inquiring as to whether boys between the ages of 7-14 years are capable of incurring irregularities from crime. The age of 7 years is fixed as one extreme because a boy cannot incur an irregularity from crime before that age since he is not subject to ecclesiastical laws (cf. canon 12). The age of 14 years is fixed as the other extreme since that age is the legal age of puberty for males (cf. canon 88, 2).

The question as to whether boys before the age of puberty are capable of contracting irregularities from crime (*ex delicto*) was the subject of discussion among authors before the Code and they were not in agreement on the point. Such difference of opinion still exists. The arguments of those who maintain that boys who have not yet attained the age of puberty do not incur irregularities from crime are based especially on the contents of canons 2204 and 2230; and in effect they are really identical with the arguments which were adduced in support of this position before the Code (cf. Gasparri, *De Sacra Ordinatione*, Vol. I, n. 202). According to canon 2204 minority—and this certainly includes the period before the age of puberty—diminishes liability for a crime, and in a progressively greater degree as it approaches infancy; while according to canon 2230 those who have not yet attained the age of puberty are freed from penalties *latae sententiae* and should be punished with educative measures rather than with censures and graver vindictive penalties.

However, the other opinion—which we ourselves favour without any hesitation—offers strong arguments in support of its contention that irregularities from crime may be incurred even before the age of puberty has been attained. Thus, the previous opinion—so it seems to us—appears to be based on a supposition which cannot be sustained; that is, the previous opinion derives from the notion that irregularity from crime is of the nature of a penalty. However, as is clear from the purpose of irregularities and the purpose of ecclesiastical penalties, irregularity from crime, like irregularity from defect, must be regarded primarily as an impediment to the reception and exercise of orders; and if there is a penal element in irregularities from crime it is certainly secondary and incidental. The reason for the institution of irregularities is founded primarily in the desire of the Church to maintain and safeguard the dignity of and reverence for the clerical state, and not in the desire to impose a penalty, whether medicinal or vindictive. Moreover, the Code states explicitly that ignorance of irregularities themselves does not excuse from incurring them (cf. canon 988); and this would not be true if they were penalties. Finally, the Code itself in another way indicates that irregularities are primarily impediments to orders and not punishments in as much as it treats of irregularities in that section of the Code which deals with the requisites for ordination, and not in the Fifth Book of the Code which treats of crimes and penalties; and, moreover, the article in the Code concerned with irregularities has the title, “De irregularitatibus aliisque impedimentis,” which seems to imply that irregularities also are impediments rather than penalties.

Furthermore, underlying the opinion that irregularities from crime are not incurred before the age of puberty there seems to be the notion that the term *delictum*, as used in the phrase *irregularitates ex delicto*, is employed in the strict canonical sense as given in canon 2195 (in the Fifth Book of the Code). However, in the article referred to by our correspondent (April issue of the *A.C.R.*) it has already been pointed out that there is good reason for maintaining that, when the legislator applies this term to the offences stated in canon 985 as the causes of the irregularities, he is not adhering to this strict signification (cf. *A.C.R.*, April, p. 157, footnote 30).

In canon 986 the legislator states that the offences set out in canon 985 give rise to irregularity if they are grave sins, committed after baptism, and external, whether public or occult. Now these acts as

performed by those who have attained the age of reason, even though they are not yet fourteen years of age, can fulfil all these conditions. Therefore, from a consideration of this canon it seems that there is nothing to prevent those who have not yet attained the age of puberty from contracting irregularities from crime.

Finally, canon 944 seems to provide a very strong confirmation of the opinion that the non-attainment of the age of puberty is not a bar to the incurrance of irregularities from crime. The first section of that canon states: "The time within which the candidate for orders *can contract a canonical impediment* is ordinarily, in the case of soldiers three months, and for others six months, after reaching the age of puberty; but the ordaining bishop according to his prudent judgment may demand testimonial letters even for a shorter period of residence, *and also for the time that preceded puberty.*" This appears to imply that canonical impediments, which would certainly include irregularities from crime, may be incurred before the age of puberty has been attained.

We ourselves feel that the preceding arguments are sufficiently cogent to remove the doubt of law that previously existed concerning the question submitted by our correspondent; and therefore we feel that if a boy between the ages of 7-14 years committed any of the offences listed in canon 985 (and all the conditions of canon 986 were fulfilled) he would incur the irregularity from crime and would need to be dispensed.

* * * *

QUESTION CONCERNING THE MARRIAGE OF VAGI.

Dear Rev. Sir,

It is stated in canon 1032 that the pastor must never assist at the marriages of *vagi* outside a case of necessity, unless he first refers the matter to the local Ordinary and obtains permission to assist. The canon states: "Matrimoni *vagorum* . . . parochus . . . nunquam assistat . . ." Does the use of the term *vagorum* imply that both parties to the marriage must belong to this class in order that the pastor should have the obligation of referring the matter to the local Ordinary? Or is he bound by this obligation even when only one party is a *vagus*?

WANDERER.

REPLY.

In answering this query it is important to call to mind the purpose of the regulation contained in canon 1032. No one will have any doubt

that its purpose is to ensure the freedom to marry of the parties to a marriage and thus to safeguard the lawfulness and validity of the marriage. The nature of the case itself and the whole context in which this canon is placed make clear this purpose. It means, therefore, that the legislator is setting down that a step not to be omitted in fulfilling the grave obligation of ascertaining the freedom to marry of a *vagus* is to refer the matter to the local Ordinary.

The term *matrimonio vagorum* is used in the canon, and this term embraces all marriages in which *vagi* are involved, and therefore even a marriage in which only one of the parties concerned is a *vagus*. This follows from the general term employed in the canon, and also from the purpose of the legislation which is the establishment of freedom to marry; because the same danger and necessity exist even in the case where only one party is a *vagus*, namely, the danger of the existence of an impeding or a diriment impediment (especially, for example, the existence of a previous marriage), and the necessity to establish freedom in the face of this possibility.

It will not be out of place to note here that the ruling of canon 1032 applies even in the case in which a person, who has no domicile or quasi-domicile, has a month's residence in a place. The qualification of the month's residence is something that has regard to the pastor's lawful assistance at the marriage; but that is an entirely different thing to the ascertainment of freedom to marry. The fact that a pastor may lawfully assist at the marriage because the party has a month's residence in his parish does not free him from the obligation of establishing freedom to marry in the manner set down in canon 1032. This, moreover, appears to be stated at least equivalently in the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, issued on 4th July, 1921. After all, the Code, in giving the definition of a *vagus*, states that a *vagus* is a person who has neither domicile nor quasi-domicile (cf. canon 91). The month's residence does not enter into the definition, and hence, as far as marriage is concerned, the absence of domicile and quasi-domicile makes a person a *vagus* even though the month's residence may be verified.

Care should be taken in declaring a person to be a *vagus*. Not infrequently persons who at first sight appear to be *vagi* are discovered on investigation still to possess a domicile or quasi-domicile elsewhere. This, of course, leaves them within the competency of the pastor of domicile or quasi-domicile, unless they also have established a month's

residence. In this case, since they possess the domicile or quasi-domicile as well as the month's residence, they are not *vagi*.

G. C. GALLEN.

*

*

*

*

BLACK POPES, by Archbishop Roberts, S.J. Longmans, Green and Co. pp. x + 139. Australian Price, 10/9.

I suppose, it is needless to say that not everything in this little book will please everybody. It is the personal opinion of the present reviewer that the book would be better, if the chapter entitled "The Crucible of Obedience" were more serenely written. The style of writing also is sometimes jerky, sometimes perhaps too *négligé*. But the book from beginning to end is splendidly interesting, wittily written, and really instructive. Archbishop Roberts has clearly not only thought out his subject but felt it. We cannot but be grateful to him for having given us this book and grateful to those who asked him for it. To them the book is devotedly dedicated.

The subject is obedience, intelligent obedience, which includes freedom of representation by the subjects to those who hold authority. In fact, the bulk of the Archbishop's pages deal with the responsibilities of Authority, its use and abuse.

The 108 pages which constitute the first part of the book are full of practical wisdom founded on the author's Jesuit training and a very rich experience. The aim is to diminish the number of Black Popes and increase the number of White Popes. Even parish priests can be Black Popes or White Popes.

As all obedience is founded on the fatherhood of God and the delegation of this fatherhood, the four chapters that constitute Part Two give us an eloquently worded and stimulating theoretical presentation of obedience. These are pages to be meditated.

W.L.

Liturgy

SHRINE OF PATRON OF A CHURCH.

Dear Rev. Sir,

i. Must the title of the high altar of a church be the same as the title of the church itself?

ii. My church has a Saint as titular, but there is no image of the titular above the high altar. Would it be permissible to erect a shrine in honour of the titular of the church at a side altar?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

1. The Code of Canon Law states that the principal Title of the high altar must be the same as the Title of the church. (Can. 1201, § 2.)

2. The solution of this query must be deduced from several liturgical laws. A fixed altar must have a title; a movable altar need not have a title, but it is desirable that it should have one (can. 1201, § 1). An image above a fixed altar, although not required by law, must correspond to the Title of the altar (*S.R.C.* 4194, 4). Commentators generally regard the same rule as being applicable to a movable altar, e.g., Moretti, *Caeremoniale*, I. 413. A further principle must be taken into account, two or more altars in the church may not have the same Title; they may, however, have different titles of the same person, e.g., our Lady of the Rosary and our Lady of Perpetual Succour (*S.R.C.* 3723, 3; 3732; 3791).

Applying the above norms to the situation described by our correspondent, we must conclude that the high altar must have the Titular Saint of the church as its Title, and any image over this altar must be that of the Titular. A side altar may not have the same Title, nor may it have an image of the Titular of church placed over it as a shrine, since the image and the Title of the altar must agree and there may not be two altars or images of the same Saint in the church. Of course, in speaking of a side altar, we understand an altar at which Mass may be celebrated, not simply a pedestal or stand constructed in the style of an altar. A possible solution which suggests itself in the circumstances is to omit the image above the high altar, and erect the shrine of the Patron Saint in some part of the church, but without any altar associated with it.

MEDAL OF SAINT BENEDICT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Could you kindly supply some details of the Medal of St. Benedict? What is the meaning of the letters inscribed on the medal and who may bless it?

ASSISTENS.

REPLY.

There are two forms of the Medal of St. Benedict, the ordinary Medal and the Jubilee or Centenary Medal. This latter is simply a special form of the medal and was first struck at Monte Cassino in 1880 to commemorate the 14th centenary of the birth of St. Benedict. The Jubilee Medal is more richly indulged than the ordinary Medal, and may be distinguished by several details in the inscriptions as will be noted below.

The Medal has been used by the faithful for many centuries; documentary evidence of its use goes back as far as the 11th and 12th centuries, and possibly even earlier. The 17th century witnessed a new impetus in the devotion due to the discovery of a manuscript containing information about the significance of the letters inscribed on the medal. St. Vincent de Paul was a zealous promoter of the devotion in France and the Daughters of Charity still wear the medal attached to their Rosary Beads.

On one side of the medal we find a cross with a number of letters engraved on it and on the other side an image of St. Benedict. Tradition assigns the peculiar form of the cross to the lifetime of the Saint himself, who was renowned for the miracles which he worked by the Sign of the Cross. The meaning of the letters inscribed on and around the cross was lost for many centuries but was recovered in 1647 in a 15th century manuscript found in the Benedictine Monastery of Natternburg (Bavaria). The letters are:—

C.S.P.B. (between the arms of the cross): Crux Sancti Patris Benedicti—The Cross of the Holy Father Benedict.

C.S.S.M.L. (on the vertical arm of the cross): Crux Sancta Sit Mihi Lux—May the holy Cross be my light.

N.D.S.M.D. (on the transverse arm of the cross): Non Draco Sit Mihi Dux—May the dragon never be my guide.

V.R.S., N.S.M.V., S.M.Q.L., I.V.B. (around the edge of the medal): Vade Retro Satana, Nunquam Suade Mihi Vana, Sunt Mala Quae Libas, Ipse Venena Bibas—Get thee behind

me Satan, never suggest evil things to me, What thou prof-
ferest is evil, drink thou the poison.

PAX (above the cross) is a feature of the Jubilee Medal.

On the other side of the medal St. Benedict is represented holding in one hand the cross and in the other his Holy Rule. The Jubilee Medal has inscribed around the edge:

Eius in obitu nostro praesentia muniamur—May we be protected
by his presence at the hour of our death.

In the background are shown a serpent coming from a cup and a raven with a loaf of bread, both of which refer to miracles recorded in the life of the Saint. Under the figure of St. Benedict is the inscription: Ex S. M. Cassino MDCCCLXXX.

The Roman Ritual (Tit. ix, cap. II, 31 & 32) has two formulas for blessing the medal, the second one being a shorter form. The blessing is reserved to priests of the Order of St. Benedict but other priests may obtain the faculty to bless the medal either from a Benedictine Abbot or from the Sacred Penitentiary.

The medal is especially used as a protection against the attacks of the devil and has been used for this purpose, with most beneficial results, by missionaries labouring in pagan lands. The inscription on the Cross is a formula of exorcism. The prayer of blessing asks of God, for those who wear the medal, health of mind and body, sanctifying grace and deliverance from the deceits and snares of the devil.

* * * *

BLESSING OF THE GREEN SCAPULAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Who may bless the Green Scapular and what form of blessing should be used?

CHAPLAIN.

REPLY.

The Green Scapular is not a scapular in the usual sense of the word, but may be described as an image of the Immaculate Heart of Mary on a green cloth. It consists of a piece of green cloth to which is attached a cord of the same colour. On one side of the cloth is an image of our Lady and on the other side an image of the Immaculate Heart of Mary encircled by the inscription: 'Immaculate Heart of Mary, pray for us now and at the hour of our death'.

The scapular may be blessed by any priest having the faculty to bless pious objects. No special form is required, simply the sign of

the Cross. To gain the benefits of the scapular, it may be worn in the usual way or attached to one's clothing or even kept in one's room. The person using the scapular should recite daily the invocation inscribed around the image: 'Immaculate Heart of Mary, &c.'; or the one who gives the scapular may recite the prayer on behalf of the wearer.

The devotion to the Green Scapular owes its origin to an apparition of our Lady to a Daughter of Charity, Sister Bisqueyburu, in 1840. It was approved by Pope Pius IX and is especially promoted by the Daughters of Charity.

*

*

*

*

SANCTA MARIA IN SABBATO.

One of the many features of the simplified form of the rubrics that will have impressed us in the course of the year is the increased number of weeks in which we recite the office of our Lady on Saturdays. This more than makes amends for the omission of the Hail Mary at the beginning of the Hours, which some regretfully regarded as a restriction of devotion to our heavenly Mother. Those who are statistically minded may read with interest the article of Father G. Low, C.S.S.R., in *Ephemerides liturgicae*, lxix (1955), pp. 336-346. The writer shows that for the remaining years of this century the office of our Lady will be recited on never less than 13 Saturdays in each year, and in 1965 it will occur 21 times. If you prefer your figures in aggregates, in the next 44 years the office of S. Maria in sabbato will be recited 691 times, as compared with a possible 290 times according to the old rubrics.

The custom of dedicating Saturday to the Blessed Virgin seems to have developed about the 10th century. From the earliest times Saturday enjoyed a special liturgical importance and was commonly observed as a day of fast. According to Pope Innocent I (+ 417), the Roman custom of fasting on Saturday was apostolic in its origin and was intended to commemorate the death and burial of our Lord. It seems more than likely that the special character of the Saturday influenced its being selected at a later date for the weekly feast of our Lady. No one will be surprised to learn that many different suggestions, for the most part legendary, have been proposed to explain the origin of the Marian dedication of Saturday. For instance, the medieval liturgist, John Beleth (+ c. 1165), narrates the miraculous happenings associated with an image of our Lady at Constantinople. The image was normally covered with a veil, except on great feastdays, but on Friday evening the veil was removed in a 'miraculous' manner and restored again on

Saturday evening. However, we have no serious historical evidence to substantiate this account or for that matter any other explanation offered for the original dedication of Saturday in honour of Mary.

St. Peter Damian and Bernold of Constance speak of devotion to the Blessed Virgin on Saturday as an established practice so it would seem that the beginning of this custom must go back to the previous century, i.e., the 10th century, and perhaps even earlier. Several votive Masses of our Lady for use on Saturday are found in some of the Sacramentaries of the same period. Some time elapsed before any authoritative move was made to adopt the devotion. A Council held at Avignon in 1326 decreed that the Mass of our Lady should be solemnly celebrated in all churches on each Saturday.

The office of our Lady seems to trace its origins back to the Benedictine Monks of Monte Cassino who introduced it as early as the 8th century. From there it spread through the various monastic institutions, but was popularised in a special way by the zeal of St. Peter Damian and Pope Urban II in the course of the 11th century.

The present arrangement of the Mass and Office of S. Maria in Sabbato was established in the reform of the Missal and Breviary carried out by Pope St. Pius V.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

CHRISTIAN DUTY TOWARDS THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

We have been considering a portion of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The portion we have chosen offers a splendidly rich Rule of Christian life. The strong religious foundation of such a life is laid in the description which the Apostle gives of the basic Christian attitude of a spiritual worship of God. This consists of the offering, in grateful return for God's mercy, of our whole selves to the accomplishment of His will and good pleasure (12: 1-2). Our second theme was humility in relation to the ordered social functions of each member of the ecclesiastical body according to the measure of God's grace imparted to each (12: 3-8). Our third homiletic exposition embraced a series of precepts which could be brought under the heading: "Charity in action" (12: 9-21).

The sequence now introduces as to St. Paul's classic passage on the duty of subjection to the civil powers. The passage consists of only seven verses (13: 1-7), but, as it forms a distinct unit, we shall confine ourselves in this note to its teachings. The next section, presenting charity as the resumé of the whole law (12: 8-10), although connected with our passage by a "hook-idea," is a separate unit, better reserved for another occasion. St. John Chrysostom does, indeed, deal with the two sections in one Homily (XXIII), but St. Chrysostom is never over-concerned with unity of subject—he prefers to talk on, till it is time to finish. We need not imitate the Patron of preachers in this fluidness, but we shall be much indebted to his exposition of our passage. It is full of suggestive ideas.

When St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, in the year 58 or perhaps a year earlier, the ruler who sat on the throne of the Caesars at Rome was Nero. He had been only a youth of 17, when the death of his step-father and adoptive father, Claudius, put the reins of the Roman Empire into his hands. That was November 10, 54 A.D. For five years—the happy quinquennium—he performed his duties well, under the tutorship of the philosopher Seneca and Burrus the Prefect of the Praetorian Guard. Although the Roman Empire was officially pagan, St. Paul had reason to think well of it as an institution that promoted order and peace. In writing to the Romans he could therefore regard it as a normal human government.

He is, however, not in the least concerned, in this passage, with the person of the ruler and the personal characters of those who carried out the imperial and senatorial administration of the Roman Empire. It is the authority which they hold that he has in mind. Writing later to Timothy between 63 and 67—when Nero's madness was showing itself in all sorts of extravagances and crimes—the Apostle's language in regard to Roman civil authority is no different. The sacredness of the authority is not questioned. He simply commends to his beloved disciple at Ephesus that "supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be offered for all men: for Kings and for all who are in high places (who hold authority), that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and dignity" (1 Tim. 3: 1, 2).

Even with a bad ruler, and even after a policy of persecution had been adopted against the Christians, the Roman State, when its commands were not opposed to the rights of God, was a normal social institution promoting the temporal good of its citizens, and therefore a divine ordinance carrying authority which derived from God.

Our Lord had not questioned but openly recognized the authority of Caesar in Palestine, and had given His enemies to understand that they also recognized that same authority in practice by accepting its coinage. There were, however, Jewish zealots who denied that a foreign ruler could have any right to rule over God's chosen people. They even quoted the Scripture of Deuteronomy 17: 15 in support of their contention. That text said: "Thou shalt set him (as king) whom thy God shall choose out of the number of thy brethren. Thou mayest not make a man of another nation king, that is not thy brother."

To Christians who had become "freed men with the freedom wherewith Christ has set us free" (Gal. 4: 1) and had "their citizenship in heaven" (Philipp. 3: 20), the question might present itself whether they owed a duty of submission to a pagan power. To this question, if it did actually arise in the minds of new converts, St. Paul gives a clear answer. This is the text:

"Let every soul be subject to ruling authorities, for there is no authority that is not appointed by God, and those that exist have been set there by God. Hence the one who refuses subjection to such authority, stands up against the ordinance of God. And those who have thus set themselves in rebellion shall receive a condemnation made by themselves. Rulers are not a cause of fear in regard to good actions, but in regard to evil actions. Dost thou wish, then, not to fear the

authority? Do what is good and thou shalt have praise from it. For he [the holder of authority] is God's minister for thy good. But, if thou shouldst do evil, be afraid, for it is not for nothing that he carries the sword. For he is the minister of God, an avenger to inflict [the] wrath [of punishment] on him who does evil. Therefore, subjection is a necessity, not only out of fear of the punishment, but also for the motive of conscience. Indeed, for that very reason you pay tribute, for they are public servants (*leitourgoi*) of God, applying themselves to this function. Pay to all men what is due; tribute to whom tribute is due; taxes to whom taxes are due; respect to whom respect is due; honour to whom honour is due."

With St. Thomas Aquinas, we can conveniently divide this passage into two sections, the first (vv. 1-6) inculcating the duty of subjection to the civil powers, the second (7) specifying some particular signs of that subjection: tribute, taxes, respect, honour.

St. Paul first lays down, in the form of an admonition, the precept of subjection to higher powers, that is, to ruling authorities. Then he shows the imperativeness of that subjection as a demand of virtue and as involving consequences.

"Let every soul be subject to ruling authorities." "Every soul," of course, is synecdoche for "every man." We have, however, kept the translation "Every soul," because it indicates the spiritual and whole-hearted character of the subjection required. It is not just a formal and external subjection. Note also that the Apostle does not say: "Be obedient" but "Be subject." The spiritual attitude towards authority comes first. According to the Greek word (*hupotassesthai*) here used, the subjection is generically the same as that given by Jesus to His parents (Lk. 2: 15), that which wives should give to their husbands (Eph. 5: 22), slaves to their masters (Tit. 2: 9). Whether the authority be domestic, economic, or political, it is God-given authority. This the Apostle proceeds to show to the Romans.

"For there is no authority but by derivation from God." This divine origin of power is a first principle, and had been taught in that famous passage of Proverbs where Wisdom says: "By me kings reign: and lawgivers establish justice—By me princes govern: and nobles, all the rulers of the earth" (8: 15, 16). It is obvious that whatever is said in common both of God and creatures, such as power, wisdom, goodness is derived in the creatures from God. Hence also the power which is authority to rule. St. Paul does not say that every power

actually existing is lawful, but he says in general that the powers that are have been ordained by God. He is speaking of normal human conditions, such as those the Romans knew and were living under. The actual distribution of power was an arrangement of Providence, whose wisdom governs the world. Certain governments have been lawful from the beginning, others in time become lawful, for anarchy is an evil.

Consequently, those who resist are rebelling against the order appointed by God. The Apostle draws this conclusion from the two premises of the divine origin of power in general and the divine ordering of the powers that are. This is stated very clearly by St. Thomas: "From two premises he draws his conclusion: For if the power of princes as such is from God, and nothing coming from God is without order, it follows that the order whereby inferiors are subjected to higher powers is from God. Hence he who opposes this power that exists opposes the ordinance of God." Even civil life, therefore, has religion inherent in it. If it is vice to resist, it is virtue to be subject, for all such subjection is really to God's sovereignty.

Subjection is also a *necessity*, for the commands of authority have their sanctions: "They that resist shall make for themselves a sentence of condemnation." The motive of salutary fear is proposed here, and, no doubt civil government has to depend much on the fear inspired by its punishments. To put it in ordinary every-day speech, we know how far disorder would run in civil society, if there were no police and courts and prisons.

However, useful as fear is, St. Paul does not confine the function of rulers to the repression of evil. Well-doing does not receive punishment from them but approval. "Magistrates are not a cause of fear in regard to good actions but in regard to bad actions. Dost thou wish not to fear the authority? Do good and thou shalt have praise from him who holds authority."

Under this aspect, in the first place, St. Paul calls the magistrate or ruler a "servant of God," a *diakonos* or deacon—"he is for thee a Minister of God in view of good." To symbolize this idea of the ruler as a "deacon" certain coronation ceremonials (no doubt inspired by this passage) vested the king in a dalmatic. The treasury of St. Peter's at Rome possesses a dalmatic said to have been worn by Charlemagne at his coronation.

The promotion of good by the ruler is a ministry, but so also is the punishment of evil. "It is not in vain that he carries the sword, for

he is a minister of God charged to chastise him who does evil—charged with a ministry of wrath.” Every punishment inflicted by authority, that is, inflicted in the name of God, is an expression of the divine wrath. As ministers of God’s justice, it is not only lawful but meritorious for princes to punish evildoers.

Then we come to the moral pith of the matter, the conclusion which the Apostle chiefly intends: “Therefore, it is necessary to be subject not only on account of punishment but also for the motive of conscience.” Not only to avoid punishment, but as a conscious homage to God the giver of all authority, we must be subject. As St. Peter was to write later (about 63-64 A.D.): “Be subject to every human institution for the Lord’s sake, whether to the king as being supreme, or to governors as being sent by him for the punishment of those who do evil and for the praise of those who do good. For it is the will of God that by doing good you should silence the ignorance of foolish men. Act as freemen, yet not as those who make freedom a cloak for malice, but as servants of God. Honour all men, love the brethren, fear God, honour the king.” (Peter, 2: 13-17).

In practice subjects recognise the office and administration of rulers and the benefits which they derive from the stable order which the rulers maintain. They contribute to the support and state of the rulers. Perhaps taxpayers, who often pay taxes just because they have to, did not think of it that way. But St. Paul teaches them the sense of what they do when he says: “That is why you pay tribute, for they are public ministers (*leitourgoi*) of God devoting themselves to this very thing.”

Who are “the public ministers of God”? Are they the magistrates or the officers of the taxation department, who were called “publicans” under a system of farmed taxation existing in St. Paul’s day? Really the context seems to point to the taxgatherers as *leitourgoi* or public servants. The word *leitourgos*, used only five times in the N.T. by St. Paul alone seems to belong to his vocabulary of sacred terms. It is the equivalent of Priest in Hebrews 8:2, where Christ is called “*leitourgos* of the sanctuary and of the perfect tabernacle”; it means priest metaphorically in Romans 15:16, where St. Paul thus denominates himself as offerer of an oblation of gentile converts; in Hebrews 1:7 the Angels are *leitourgoi* of God; in Philippians 2:25 Epaphroditus is the official minister of that Macedonian Church sent (with alms) to help St. Paul in his needs. The probabilities, then, are that here also the sense of *leitourgos* is tinged with a certain sacredness. Christians of St.

Matthew's profession would have read his words with pleasure.

On the sentence which follows: "Render to each one his due: tribute (direct taxation) to whom tribute, taxes (indirect levies) to whom taxes, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour is due," let us quote the remarks of St. Chrysostom referring to the last phrases:

"Do not suppose that you are lowering yourself, and taking away from the dignity of your mode of life, if you rise up in the presence of a ruler, or if you uncover your head. For if St. Paul laid these laws down at that time, when the rulers were heathens, much more ought this be done with them, when they are Christians. But, if you mean to say that *your* privileges are greater, call to mind that your time is not come. You are still a stranger and a sojourner. A time shall come when you shall appear in all your splendour. Now your life is hid with Christ in God." Humility is the law of nobility in this pilgrimage. We should think more often of our duties of subjection, respect and honour.

W. LEONARD.

*

*

*

*

SO NEAR IS GOD. By James M. Gillis, C.S.P., London: Burns Oates. 1954. Pp. 210. Australian price, 24/3.

This is a series of twenty-six essays on moral and spiritual topics by Fr. Gillis, of the Paulist Fathers, a well-known American writer and lecturer. The first section treats of such subjects as Self-Knowledge, the Incarnation, the Presence of God in nature and the soul. The author in the second part deals with Conscience, Self-discipline, Sin and Temptation, the Cross, Moral Standards and Values. The third part contains five chapters on Prayer and concludes with an essay on the Psalms. In the final section there are essays on the Blessed Virgin, the Effects of Holy Communion and sundry other subjects. During the course of the essays the author deals with some of the aberrations evident in modern thought and gives a penetrating analysis of much that is shallow and baseless in present day culture.

Fr. Gillis brings to the writing of this work over fifty years of priestly experience and it is evident that these essays are the result of a life-time of reading, reflection and contact with souls. The work is written in a refreshingly vigorous style. The numerous well chosen quotations, from authors sacred and profane,—Cardinal Newman and St. Augustine are particular favourites—reveal the great scholarship of the writer. The author writes: (p. 196) 'What I aim at is to stimulate quiet meditation and patient contemplation of religious truth'. In this he succeeds. Each chapter contains much that is thought-provocative. Cardinal Spellman has contributed an appreciative Foreword in praise of the author and his work.

B.B.

Notes

In the large field of colonial history this is only a minor point, but when Dr. Bland died on Tuesday, July 21, 1868, a few days short of his 79th birthday, it was one of considerable local interest.

William Bland—dishonorably discharged
WAS from the Royal Navy for killing another in a
WILLIAM BLAND duel with pistols and banished to Botany Bay
CONVERTED? for seven years; later, tragically betrayed in his
first marriage—outspoken patriot, politician,
philanthropist, medical practitioner, and controversial public figure
through a large part of half a century: did he become a Catholic on his
death-bed? There are grounds for doubt, though, it seems the greater
doubt is with the truth of the assertion that he did not.

There are some confusing features to the question. For instance, on June 16th, "the late Bro. Dr. Bland" visited the Unity Lodge of Freemasons and "expressed himself so pleased with his reception that he determined to join." But the ballot for his admission was not held as it was scheduled to take place on the evening of the day he died.¹

Bland's last illness was of about a week's duration. During that last week, so the *Herald* reported,² "he was several times visited by the Venerable Archbishop Polding, with whom he had been associated for many years in movements having for their object the social, moral, and political elevation of the people." It was understood that the body was to be removed to St. James' Church prior to burial. But the notice of undertaker James Curtis—a Catholic—made no mention of this and merely stated that "the funeral will move from his late residence in College Street . . . and proceed by train to the Necropolis."

Bland's remains were accorded an Anglican burial. The cortege did move from his residence, but half an hour before the time originally stated, and went via King Street, stopping at St. James', where the coffin was carried into the Church and the Bishop of Sydney read the first portion of the burial service. Out at the Necropolis at Haslem's Creek, the remainder of the service was "impressively read by the Bishop assisted by his attendant clergymen." Archdeacon McEncroe, and Fathers John Dwyer and Norbert Woolfrey attended the funeral.³

¹Or so reported the Lodge in the "*Sydney Morning Herald*," July 28th.

²*S.M.H.*, July 22nd.

³*Ibid.*, July 24th.

On July 25th, the *Freeman's Journal*, in concluding an honorable notice of Bland's colonial career, said that on the day prior to his demise he had asked for Archbishop Polding and Archdeacon McEncroe and informed them that he wished to join the Church, "a blessing which was conferred upon him before he expired."

Was this statement correct? It appeared, at first, that either it or the one that appeared in the Anglican *Australian Churchman* must be in error. *The Churchman* had said that, at Bland's request, on Sunday (July 19th), "the prayers of the Church were offered, morning and evening, in his behalf, at his own Church, St. James'. The Rev. W. C. Cave, curate in charge, visited him twice on that day, and during his latter visit at 9 p.m., complied with his anxious desire and administered Holy Communion to him, his wife, and some other friends. The doctor was in a most satisfactory state of mind . . ." *The Churchman* also remarked that the Lord Bishop of Sydney had conducted the service "by the request of his widow."⁴

Here the *Herald* did not join issue, but merely published: "We are requested by a correspondent to state that Mr. Cox, of Warburne, was with Dr. Bland before and up to the time of his death and that the report in reference to the conversion . . . has no foundation beyond the fact that Archbishop Polding offered a prayer as a friend—a prayer in which there was nothing that could be objected to by a Protestant."⁵ Another source⁶ called the rumour an unfounded one which "has since been disproved on the most positive authority, and its authors justly held up to public contempt."

In reply, the *Freeman's Journal* in a leader written, so it said, "in consequence of the enquiries of many friends and to contradict the misstatements that have been set afoot by prejudiced parties," came forward with what appears to be a conclusive statement.⁷ Much the same was also printed in the *Illustrated Sydney News*.⁸ The authority was said to be "the very best," though it was unspecified: was it from the Archbishop, the Archdeacon, or someone else? In essence, it was claimed that Bland had had long-standing and strong predilections towards the Catholic Church and that this was so well-known by his intimate friends that "a Catholic lady of high social position" had lent

⁴*Ibid.*, July 30th.

⁵*Ibid.*, July 31st.

⁶*Illustrated Sydney News*, August 7th.

⁷August 8th.

⁸Sept. 4th.

him books of Catholic devotion. "A venerable and highly respected pastor in Sydney (Archdeacon McEncroe?), who was highly esteemed by Dr. Bland, "always proclaimed his belief" that the Doctor would be received before he died. Latterly there had been frequent visits between the two, on one of which the priest had recommended Bland to reflect that his last end could not be far off; on another, when in Bland's house, he had been shown "a precious memento in the shape of a Catholic prayer book presented to Mrs. Bland by . . . Fr. Therry . . ." After this visit other books were sent to Bland, including the Archdeacon's "Wanderings of the Human Mind in Searching the Scriptures."

"On the day previous to his death he sent one of his medical friends, Dr. A'Beckett, for . . . the Archbishop and . . . the Archdeacon . . . and a note was despatched to Dr. Forrest of St. John's College . . . requesting his immediate presence." (The weather was wet and inclement.) The Archbishop arrived first and found Bland "conscious and in full possession of his faculties." He expressed a desire to be received into the Church and the Archbishop proceeded with the necessary instructions. Soon afterwards the Archdeacon entered and "conditionally baptised him in the presence of a few Protestant friends of the Doctor, and Mrs. Bland with her own hands brought in the holy water . . ." In the afternoon the Archbishop returned and continued his pious exercises with the sick man until about 9 p.m., when Extreme Unction was administered. Within a few hours Bland had passed away.

In explanation of the Anglican rites accorded his remains it was said that "his aged relict, being altogether unable to take any business arrangements upon her, the disposition of the funeral was left to his private friends. The dignitaries who received him . . . did not feel themselves called upon to interfere in any way with these arrangements, knowing well that since the immortal soul was such, much concern was not needed about the perishable body. Moreover, they were desirous of avoiding the creation of unpleasant feelings in the minds of any parties and of preventing the arising of popular feeling in the matter" (as enough of that, no doubt, had been experienced with the unfortunate O'Farrell Affair of a short while before).

So much for the evidence. The *Freeman's Journal* seemed very sure of its elaborate statements and the matter appears to have rested there. From the point of view of timing there is nothing really contrary to the death-bed conversion, except perhaps in the statement

alleged to have originated with Mr. Cox. Probably the Rev. Cave was with Bland on the Sunday, but there was no suggestion that he was there on the Monday. On the other hand all sources seem to agree that, at least, Dr. Polding was present on the Monday. Had he been there contrary to Bland's own wishes it can be imagined what 'hot news' such a forced imposition would have produced.

It is almost certain, then, that Bland died a Catholic. However, without an authentic documental proof of the baptism a definite assertion must carry with it some measure of doubt.

R. A. DALY.

*

*

*

*

The appearance of a volume in the superb series *Dictionnaire des Lettres Francaises* which Cardinal Georges Grente, the venerable Archbishop-Bishop of Le Mans, initiated and edited, is of SOME literary and historical interest. Cardinal Grente has RECENT brought to the Sacred College his talents and comprehensive BOOKS sion that the French Academy had already honoured with membership. Two volumes have already appeared, one dealing with the sixteenth century, while in 1954 the long awaited vast volume in 1028 pages devoted to the seventeenth century was printed. The great century, rich in literature, magnificent in sanctity, Christian eloquence and learning, has had the loving attention of the Cardinal, an expert in the field, combined with a remarkable team, headed by Paul Valery, the poet, Emile Henriot, Maurois, Gustave Cohen, Gustave Bardy (whose recent death has removed a most excellent worker in the history of Christian antiquity), Daniel-Rops, Daniel Mornet and a host of others. It will be noted that Cardinal Grente by his charming enthusiasm was able to pick a team of writers of all schools of thought. His sole aim is the truth without the pernicious bias of anti-clericalism, and, it may be added, of clericalism.

Open the great volume (and unhappily very expensive volume), your eye lights on La Salle (Saint Jean-Baptiste de) 1651-1719; hurry on, you see the articles headed La Fontaine, Bossuet, Pascal (this year 1956 in the third centenary of the *Provincial Letters* as it is also the fourth centenary of the death of St. Ignatius Loyola), Boileau, Madame Guyon, Fénelon, Molière, Bourdaloue, Madame de Sévigné, Rapin, Racine, Descartes, Corneille, the great Arnauld, the learned historian Tillemont, and so the great list goes on for a thousand and more pages, which Cardinal Grente holds in the patriotic fervour of age as proclaim-

ing the great things as well as the mean things which *Sa Majesté la langue française* (to use Cardinal Villeneuve's words) accomplished in the century of Louis XIV.

The 17th century—that of St. Francis de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, Madame de Chantal, St. Margaret Mary, Bérulle, St. John Eudes—developed in such a fashion that the cruel divisions of the preceding century of Luther and Calvin seemed likely to be healed, as is shown by the famous interchange of views between Leibniz and Bossuet. If you think Bossuet was always the preacher, read his *History of the Variations of Protestantism!* And, yet it was this century that prepared for the spiritual desert of the Age of Reason, the catastrophe of the Revolution, and the dreary Church and State quarrel of the 19th century. But Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Hugo, Balzac, Goncourts, etc., lie ahead for Cardinal Grente and his fellow workers. In this pragmatic age it is nice to see the Pope recognizing the labours of a gentle old man, who loves the beauty of literature, which in spite of the advance of science still speaks to the human heart, inflaming and ennobling our sad lives.

In a recent book the well-known English Catholic journalist, Michael de la Bedoyere has recalled in a popular fashion the controversy between Fénelon and Bossuet.¹ "The story that I tell in these pages," writes Count de la Bedoyere, "is unlikely to be familiar to most British readers, though it is 'required reading' for any Frenchman with a pretence to knowledge about the cultural and literary history of his own country and of Europe." Naturally ecclesiastical readers are not included in the above, because the quarrel was about the unfortunate question of Quietism, which together with Jansenism, brought so many fine efforts during the 17th century to sad failure. Quietism, yes, but also Madame Guyon! Hence the author's very journalistic title of his book *The Archbishop and the Lady*. Fénelon with the passage of the centuries has reaped the reward of his disgrace: he is dangerously hailed as a French Newman; Bossuet is found in this book in the unsuitable role of Manning. Madame Guyon was a curious woman who had, she felt, a mission from God "to spread the mystical doctrine of finding God *within* the soul, through the loss of all self-love, even the loss of the enjoyment of Divine consolations and guidance. The destruction of everything human was the passport to pure love." The exposure and condemnation of Molinos in Rome, led to the arrest and examination of

¹*The Archbishop and the Lady*. London, 1956. Collins. 256 pp.

Madame Guyon and her spiritual director, the unfortunate Barnabite, La Combe. Madame Guyon had the quiet persistency typical of such extravagant people, so that eventually she was released from a quasi-confinement after due examination.² It was to be hoped that nothing more would be heard of her. Through a relation, however, she was introduced to Madame de Maintenon, the excellent and devout second wife of Louis XIV, who at Saint-Cyr had established a school for girls, which she hoped would be the model for all. Madame Guyon found fresh fields to plant with the seed of Pure Love. The brilliant Abbé de Fénelon moved in Madame de Maintenon's circle, where the author of *Télémaque* was looked upon as the rising star in the Church of France. As Harlay, Archbishop of Paris, refused to die (and when he did wits said that his funeral oration would be easy to deliver, provided that neither his life nor his death were to be touched upon!) Fénelon became Archbishop of Cambrai, then an immense and wealthy archdiocese. To the indignation of Madame de Maintenton and of Bossuet, who had consecrated him, the Swan of Cambrai had been deeply impressed by Madame Guyon's sincerity. He recognized her extravagances; her genuine religious experiences were always defended by Fénelon. The author of the above book assails Bossuet, as narrow and ignorant in the field of mystical prayer. Henri Bremond had given great support to the defence of Fénelon, dismissing Bossuet as a "sublime journalist." Fénelon wrote his book *Maxims of the Saints* to show that his views on Pure Love but reflected the teaching of the saints. After a good deal of lobbying at Rome by Bossuet's nephew, a priest, which makes unpleasant reading, Pope Innocent XII with grief condemned Fénelon's work. Fénelon by his superb act of submission has won the respect of all. He had the consolation too of knowing that the papal affection for him was undiminished.

It is a pity that *The Archbishop and the Lady* is written with such vehemence in the sections dealing with Bossuet. The author who boasts of being a journalist has our gratitude in reviving in this lively book the Bossuet and Fénelon affair which has always an interest for ecclesiastics. Now to leave the 17th century for a moment, as Father Brodrick's new book *St. Ignatius Loyola*³ shifts attention to the opening of the 16th century. Father Brodrick's two earlier volumes on the history of the Society of Jesus had led his readers to expect an advance

²Not so La Combe, who died a lunatic in his prison.

³London, 1956, 372 pp. Illust.

(they were anxious to know if Jansenius would be the *poor* Jansenius and if Pascal was also a *poor* fellow—both outsiders in the Brodrick world of “goodies” and “baddies,” e.g., Melchior Cano, Paul IV, the French in general), but the new book is a return to the formative years of St. Ignatius on the occasion of the fourth centenary of the saint’s death. The account of the early years and aspirations of St. Ignatius is told by the author with full detail and verve. Indeed one feels that Father Brodrick had to stretch his materials to fill 357 pages. But as his large band of readers know, the pen of the master will not falter. For instance the stay of Ignatius at Paris allows Father Brodrick to indulge in a violent attack on Baron Haussmann. It is a gem for collectors of *Brodrickana*. Who was Baron Haussmann? Was he an outsider who blocks the path of the author? The baron was a minister under Napoleon III, who carried out large scale replanning of Paris. He irritates Father Brodrick intensely because he destroyed so much of the old Paris that St. Ignatius had known, so that Father Brodrick cannot commune with the past as he would have liked to, but finds himself stuck in the middle of a huge avenue of Haussmann’s Paris. Hence the unlucky Haussmann is beyond what has been up to this the ultimate in Brodrick’s charitable contempt the *poor* Haussmann. No, the Baron turns out to be a *bull-dozing Baron*, a *Vandal* who happily “could not straighten out the looping Seine”; but in how many districts of the city it must be said: “Haussmann had been in those parts” or “Baron Haussmann and his kind” or “the depredations of the ineffable Haussmann” or “the terrible pirate Haussmann” or “the black-hearted Haussmann,” etc. And poets and painters still find beauty in Paris! Really on the Last Day Father Brodrick had better beware of the Baron’s submission of lack of charity. The chapter on the vow of St. Ignatius and his companions on Montmartre on August 15, 1534, is well done. In spite of Haussmann’s machinations “the place of the vows is still happily consecrated to prayer... This is the heart of modern Montmartre with the Sacré Coeur on one side and the Moulin Rouge on the other.” Neat eh! This chapter, by the way, is entitled: *Sunrise on Montmartre*, which gives another slant to one’s view of the austere author of *St. Peter Canisius*. Take just another gem about the Boulevard Saint-Michel, the “Boul ‘Mich’ of the modern romantics, to be seen; serious good fellows, earnestly discussing Sartre or Anouilh or some other frightful pessimist in vogue, over a bottle of cheap wine.” The ‘cheap wine’ is superb.

The book is a lovely one that reads itself, you go, as you see, to all kinds of places and meet all kinds of people with Father Brodrick ever at your side helping you to place the good fellows, while being jolly decent about the unfortunates with hairy heels, and it is beautifully illustrated also. No doubt Pascal's shade has remarked to that of Baron Haussmann: 'Now I am up to him for due punishment. I can stand anything but that 'poor Pascal' stuff. Do you think he might be kind and call me a serious good fellow . . . ?' There is something of the ardent sportsmaster in Father Brodrick's writing, and a really horrid nightmare for Pascal would be if the enthusiastic hockey mistress of Maisie Ward teamed up with —! Pascal has already decided to use the word Laynez threw at Melchior Cano, a word that can only be printed thus —.⁴

Now with regret we turn to two of the most infuriating and exasperating books that have been inflicted on the long suffering paying public. And it is a shame to say that they are the latest volumes in celebrated collection *Histoire de l'Eglise*, by Fliche and Martin, whose first eight or nine were succulent. Since the war, the standard has slipped, reaching the dead limit in these two volumes.⁵ Misprints abound (Montheim for Hontheim, Ewen for Even—any page, really, is stained in this matter), titles of books misquoted, e.g., the book of Hontheim-Febronius appears as *De Statu praesenti Ecclesiae liber* which is about half the real title, the text is a collection of names and dates which would exhaust any normal reader. Just one sample of the irritating obscure style, from the account of the suppression of the Society of Jesus by Clement XIV. It is the conclusion of the author: "Their abolition (i.e., members of S.J.) was a grave event. The papacy had been able to count upon their support in its struggle against the Reformation for two and a half centuries. After a rearguard action, the Papacy had abandoned an institute, which was one of the columns of the temple. At the same epoch, in France, the Commission of the Regular Clergy sacrificed other religious bodies, some years before the Austrian States and before the French Revolution." Since the brief *Dominus ac*

⁴J. Brodrick, *The Origin of the Jesuits*, London, 1942, pp. 232-33. Father Brodrick adds: "Poor Melchior, it was hard on him not to be able to tell his audiences the exact word used by Laynez!"

⁵*Les Luites politiques et doctrinales aux XVII et XVIII siècles*, by E. Preclin and E. Jarry. Two parts, 838 pp. Paris, 1955-1956. M. Preclin died before publication. At the end of the volume for some unknown reason there is Index (drawn up by the office boy seemingly). No index has appeared in any volume during the last twenty years, as the last volume of the collection was to be a general Index.

Redemptor was dated July 21, 1773, naturally events in France at the same epoch were prior to 1789. You hardly need to send a bank draft to Paris, and in advance too for the second volume, to learn that. The editors and publishers of this famous history should withdraw these two volumes from their collection. The paying public does not mind paying so much if it gets something of value, not just to be told that the suppression of the Jesuits was a grave event.

Just one more book which no doubt will figure in the first section of the *A.C.R.* where the corpse will be buried with the honours of the Holy Office. It is a nasty bit of work by Roger Peyrefitte, *Les Clés de Saint Pierre*, published at Paris in 1955, and which has sold over one hundred thousand copies. Peyrefitte is one of the younger French novelists who is following in the very well worn footsteps of Anatole France, but without the allusive charm and style of France, who is now so completely out of favour.

Peyrefitte wrote two amusing books about the French diplomatic service, gingered up when true humour failed him by attributing immoral practices to all and sundry, including a stock Jesuit. The first of these books was translated into English under the title *The Ambassadors*, but it has not attracted much attention. It is to be hoped we shall be spared a *Keys of Saint Peter* with its impudent descriptions of the Pope and ecclesiastical life in Rome. His trick is to use the proper names of living Cardinals and theologians in absurd situations, e.g., the ambassador of France, M. d'Ormesson (actually) comes to see Cardinal Tisserant about canonisations. His object is to prevent the canonisation of Innocent XI, and to get some others. The Cardinal says you have St. Peter Chanel. The ambassador replies that St. Chanel only recalls to a Parisian a dress-shop. The ambassador urges that there should be more French saints, while he admits the luxurious growth of Italian causes which is natural in so Catholic a country, especially after the example given by the General Staff of the Church . . . M. Peyrefitte almost pauses for a laugh. Sometimes naturally he is really amusing, but for the most part he sticks to the safe path of attributing immorality to ecclesiastics, and of course his pet Jesuit turns up again as large as life here. It is so boring that it should find no translator, yet as it is a dangerous book—only to be taken up with tongs, said the *Etudes* (June, 1955)—the enemies of the Church and morality might well deem the game worth the candle.

T. VEECH.

Book Reviews

PATRISTIC HOMILIES ON THE GOSPELS. Vol. I (first Sunday of Advent to Quinquagesima). Translated and edited by M. F. Toal, D.D. Mercier Press, Cork, 1955.

It should be superfluous to recommend a book which, in a Foreword, receives praise from such a high and responsible authority as the Master of the Sacred Palace (now General of the Dominicans). Father Michael Browne himself, we understand, suggested this work to Dr. Toal, and this is the first of four volumes to be. It has been prepared during the last few years in the shadow of St. Peter's Basilica, with all the helps available at the Papal Library of the Vatican nearby.

We have here in English dress Patristic (and a few post-patristic) homilies on the Gospels of fifteen Sundays, the maximum number covering the seasons from the beginning of Advent to Quinquagesima. Christmas and Epiphany are also catered for. To have those treasures of homiletic instruction within reach in such convenient form will be a real boon to priests who have to explain the Sunday Gospels from the pulpit. As Father Browne says in his Foreword, "a sermon well prepared on the matter here supplied cannot fail to be learned, solid, simple and effective."

In making a choice of pieces for this first substantial volume (500 pages), Dr. Toal has followed the great *Bibliotheca Patrum Concionatoria*, compiled in the second half of the seventeenth century by a distinguished Dominican Patrologist, Francois Combéfis. This great folio work, which first appeared at Paris in 1662 contained the Latin texts of those Sunday homilies—reprinted 1681. But Dr. Toal, in preparing his translation has gone to the original texts and to the best available editions. Thus he lists in scholarly fashion not only the Greek and Latin Patrologies of Migne, but the Corpus Vindobonense (CSEL), Graffin's Patrologia Syriaca, and the Patrologia Orientalis, as well as some studies and texts published by that extraordinary Benedictine of Maredsous, Dom Germanus Morin.

Dr. Toal also had the help of some excellent advisers. He mentions in particular Dom Chrysostom Baur, the greatest living authority on the life and writings of St. John Chrysostom.

Nevertheless, we doubt whether he exercised his critical faculty enough. For instance, under the second Sunday of Advent, he gives an alleged Homily of St. Patrick, with no further discussion than a short note saying that it is not challenged in the tables published in 1952 by Mgr. Glorieux of Lille "Pour revaloriser Migne." He also says, however, that this same homily on "The three habitations" is also given, as doubtful, under the name of St. Augustine in the Appendix of an earlier volume of Migne.

For each Sunday the parallel Gospels are given, and the relative passage of the Catena Aurea of St. Thomas Aquinas. This is, of

course, most valuable. The Catena is a wonderful compilation, and it always carries the authority of the Angel of the School, even if many—very many perhaps—of the pieces do not belong to the Fathers under whose names they are placed.

Wherever we have been able to test the translation, we have found that it is accurately and skilfully done. It would indeed be difficult for a reviewer to carry out extensive tests, and we cannot claim to have done so. On the principle, however, that a few passages closely examined can speak for the work in general, we can be confident that Dr. Toal has adequately expressed the thought of his texts.

We must feel truly grateful to him, and wish him life and health to publish the other three volumes he has promised. Pastoral life is a life of little leisure, and surely priests will be glad to have access so conveniently to the homiletic treasures of Origen and Chrysostom, Cyril and Ephrem, of Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine, of Hilary, Leo and Gregory, even of Alcuin and Aelred and Bernard, not to mention names less well known, such as Amphilochius and Aphraates and Isidore of Pelusium.

We have noted some misspellings of proper names, but, on the whole, the book is a very good and attractive specimen of typography and binding.

W.L.

*

*

*

*

ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD. By John Bligh, S.J. Sheed & Ward, London and New York. 1956. XV. 189 pp. 16/- stg.

A book which promises help towards a fuller understanding of the character, graces and powers of their Order, will be accepted readily by priests. The work under review fulfills this promise by a study of the Rite of Ordination, viewed in its dogmatic and historical setting. In the first part, headed 'Introductory', we have a brief but adequate survey of the Theology of the Order of Priesthood, and are enabled to recall the effects of the Sacrament which are signified and produced by the sacred Rite. We are thus prepared for the second part, where the development of the Rite is traced to its culmination in the present Pontifical, "a harmonious whole . . . (it) falls into an admirable pattern, which is a pleasure to contemplate."

Father Bligh points out that priests are essentially helpers and official assistants of the Bishops (*cooperatores ordinis nostri*); therefore, he would seem to conclude, they are raised to a status, wherein they may be empowered to do all the Bishop does. Such an extensive meaning of the term *cooperatores* for those who have received only the *secundi meriti munus* would not be universally accepted. The functions of the priest, mentioned in the exhortation to the ordinands: 'to offer sacrifice, to bless, to preside, to preach and to baptise' do not form an exhaustive list. There is no reference to the power of absolving or of anointing. The functions enumerated are those commonly exercised by

priests when the exhortation was composed. The author holds that from priestly Ordination we receive the power to consecrate the Eucharist and to administer Extreme Unction, which powers we may exercise validly by virtue of the Sacrament of Orders. For the administration of Penance and Confirmation and whatever Orders a priest may be empowered to give, we are raised to a status and thus made capable of receiving the requisite (juridical) power by proper authorisation from the legitimate ecclesiastical superior, the Bishop or the Supreme Pontiff. It is true that the power of Order does not suffice for absolution, as the judicial nature of the Sacrament of Penance requires jurisdiction, which is had either from the Ordinary or from law. But it is difficult to understand how an external commission can enable a priest to act as the extra-ordinary minister of Confirmation and Orders (and the author subscribes to the opinion that he can be authorised to confer even the Priesthood), unless the power to do so is already contained some way or another in what he received at his own ordination. The power of Orders is required for the valid administration of all the sacraments, except Baptism and Matrimony, and the power of Orders comes from the sacrament which Christ instituted to give the *potestas ad sacra tradenda*.

Though the rite of Ordination, as we have it, successively portrays the conferring of different powers of the Priesthood, since the Constitution of Pope Pius XII. *Sacramentum Ordinis* (30 Nov., 1947), it is certain that all these powers are received at one moment, being given by the imposition of the Bishop's hands and the words of the form in the Preface. In the chapter, "Essentials and Non-Essentials," Father Bligh summarises the opinions current at different ages as to what constituted the essence of the Rite of priestly ordination. In the simple rite practised at Rome during the first ten centuries, there was no room to doubt that the essentials were the Bishop's prayer and the imposition of hands. In the Gallicanized Gelasian rite of the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries, when the imposition of hands preceded the prayer of consecration and was followed by the anointing, it does not appear certain if any particular ceremony were considered as marking the moment of Ordination. Later, as the anointing was the climax of the rite, there are indications that grace of consecrating was received at the anointing. The scholastics stressed the tradition of the instruments as signifying the power of offering sacrifice, which was the essential power of the priest. St. Thomas in his Commentary on the Sentences (in IV. Sent. d. 24, q. 2, a. 3) thought of the tradition of the instruments as giving the character of the priesthood. *Principalis actus sacerdotis est consecrare corpus Christi; sed ad hoc datur potestas in acceptione calicis. Ergo tunc imprimitur character.* By the imposition of hands was given the abundance of grace: *per manus impositionem datur plenitudo gratiae, per quam ad magna officia sunt idonei.* An interesting section in the *Decretum pro Armenis* concludes that it is no more than an interpretation to be taught to the Armenians of the rite of Ordination, as then

practised in the Armenian Church and learned by them from Latin Missionaries. The Constitution of 1947 deliberately avoided saying what was the matter and form before its promulgation. For practical purposes and to put an end to scruples, it removes all disputes for the future: the whole essence of the Ordination is in the imposition of hands and the form *Da quaesumus*. The other ceremonies merely signify in detail what has been effected by the matter and form.

In the second part: "Description and Explanation of the Modern Rite" we are on surer ground. Among the interesting points treated are the participation of the priests in the imposition of hands, and the concelebration of the newly-ordained. The imposition of the hands of the clergy cannot be the conferring of the Sacrament, for one reason that they do not recite the form: it is a gesture of approval and acceptance, and has no sacramental significance. Concelebration probably had its rise in Rome: its inclusion in the Mass of Ordination does not date beyond the thirteenth century.

This book can be recommended as giving much useful information, and as such will also prove a source of thoughts for meditation. Not merely seminarians preparing for Ordination, but priests to whom the exercise of their powers has become, as it were, second nature, will profit from its careful reading.

J.M.

*

*

*

*

REMEMBERED IN BLESSING: The Courtfield Story. By a Mill Hill Father. (Sands & Co. 1955. 155 pp. 4/6d stg.).

This is the barest outline of the story of that remarkable English family: the Vaughans. Actually the telling is by no means bare, and we would like all Australians to read this most interesting book. To most readers out here it will come as a revelation that Roger Vaughan, second archbishop of Sydney, came from a family of which six sons became priests and four daughters nuns. Older readers will be familiar with the two-volume *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, by J. G. Snead-Cox, and with Father Martindale's *Memoir of Father Bernard Vaughan, S.J.* Those books are probably out of print by now, to the great loss of Catholics who, in this, our, day, need to see humility and generosity lived in the "grand manner." For that reason such unpretentious little books as the one now under review do a signal service to Catholic life and letters.

Perhaps the most attractive of the Vaughan sons was the eldest, Herbert, founder of the Mill Hill Fathers, the first English Missionary Society: St. Joseph's Missionary Society, to give it its full title. Later, he became Cardinal Vaughan. When, as a boy, he asked his father's permission to become a priest, the father could not endure the thought that the ancestral manor, *Courtfield House*, would not go to his eldest son; but, grand Catholic father that he was, he gave permission. To-day, that old home houses a family, honourable beyond the dreams of

old Colonel Vaughan. It is a Mill Hill Missionary House. Thus is history written in the annals of heaven.

We cannot refrain from quoting a fragment of the last pages of Cardinal Vaughan's diary: "Continue to work at meekness, gentleness and sympathy, and so die to self to live for others. . . . The work of souls in England appears more than ever to depend on the supernatural. . . ." When he died in 1903, his eloquent Jesuit brother, Bernard, delivered the panegyric to the Fathers and Brothers of St. Joseph's Society for Foreign Missions. It is a touching document even to read; it must have been a moving experience to have heard it delivered by one of the greatest preachers of the day—and that preacher, his proud but sorrowing brother.

At the back of all this distinction and holiness we find parents whose natural and spiritual gifts place them apart, setting a seal of true greatness on their devoted lives. Future memoirs of priests growing up in England may reveal lives of parents, equally distinguished for their faith and piety; but there can be few stories to equal the story of Colonel Vaughan and his wife who willingly gave ten of their children to the service of God.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

A SEED THAT GREW, by H. A. Johnston, S.J., Sydney, 1956. XII, 132 pp. Illust.

The subtitle of Father Johnston's book: A hundred years of Catholic life on the North Shore, 1856-1956, is an accurate description of its interesting contents. Every year now sees parishes, and soon institutions, celebrating the first hundred years of their history. In 1956, to speak of but a few examples in N.S.W., Albury, North Sydney and Wellington have a century of Catholic life up. In Australian history that means an advance from the most primitive conditions to the advanced state of the present day all in the span of a hundred years. Take an example of a European town, for instance, Louvain, which was first spoken of in the ninth century when the great forests were being conquered by men (Louvain means a marshy wood). It took centuries before the town developed its urban institutions, its "liberties." Yet, Albury is already a city! Father Johnston wisely decided to paint a big canvas, and his splendid sketch of the Catholic life on the North Shore of Sydney Harbour is a valuable addition to the growing list of parochial histories, which as the years go by will become very precious. Father Therry, naturally, knew the sparsely populated North Shore district, but to Father Peter Powell fell the honour of becoming the first resident priest on the North Shore. He erected the first church—a wooden structure—in 1856. An engaging picture is given of this genial Irishman and his successor, in 1867, that very well known priest, Dean Kenny, who erected the first stone church the following year. In 1878 the Jesuit Fathers were entrusted with the care of the parish by Archbishop Vaughan. In 1896, Dean Kenny's church was so

enlarged that it can be regarded as the third church that has stood on this splendid site. Finally in 1938, during the pastorate of Father Richard O'Mara the present imposing and dignified edifice was completed. As John O'Brien did in *On Darlinghurst Hill*, Father Johnston gives more than a chronicle of parish affairs—buildings, schools, priests and people—he describes the gradual development of the North Shore from the Lane Cove River to Palm Beach. So even if you are not directly interested in St. Mary's, North Sydney, you can yet find interest in this lively story of Catholic activities in Father Powell's old, immense parish, ranging from the North Shore line (exceedingly U) to the non-U activities of certain popular beaches, which, according to the locals, can knock spots off the Lido, the Riviera and Waikiki.

It is to be hoped that Father Johnston's book will be widely read. Further it is to be hoped that parishes approaching the first century will imitate the zeal and research of such fine records as *On Darlinghurst Hill*, *A Seed That Grew*, and the carefully compiled account of Catholic life at Albury. We look forward to the reading of Wellington's story of the church at the meeting of the waters of the Macquarie and the Bell. Moreover the A.C.R. ever extends a welcome to all who wish to publish a Note on the fast fading picture of the old days in Australia's Catholic history. T.V.

*

*

*

*

THE MOTHER OF GOD, by M. M. Philipon, O.P., M.S.T. Translated by Rev. John A. Otto, Ph.D. The Mercier Press Ltd., Cork. Pp. 154. English price, 7/6.

"It would be taking a singularly diminished view of the mystery of Mary if we considered it by itself, in isolation. The fact is that the stupendous destiny of this woman unfolds itself against the vast horizons of the Redemption." Thus Father Philipon gives us the key to this excellent treatment of the theology of Mary. To him Mary is essentially the co-redeemer of the human race, the Mother who merited congruently what her Son merited condignly. While the divine motherhood is the "first principle upon which the whole science of Mary is based," nevertheless, it is only at the foot of the cross that the whole of the divine plan concerning her falls into perspective.

Father Philipon, in speaking of Mary's mediation, adopts the view that she should be acknowledged as a "real instrument in the supernatural action by which we receive the divine life of grace." "God the Father chose her as the Mother of all His adopted children; the Son Incarnate made her a partner in His entire work of redemption; and in the sanctification of souls the Holy Spirit employs her as an instrument of predilection. Accordingly, we can say in all truth that nothing comes about in the supernatural order without the mediatory action of Mary."

The book is completed by eleven short theological notes (22 pages) and a comprehensive index. The translation is clear and reads very smoothly. Father Philipon's book will be a boon to those who wish to base their devotion to Our Blessed Lady on a solid theological footing.

B.F.R.

General Index

Contents of Vol. XXXIII.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)	
Archbishop Duhig, Papal Letter to, on his episcopal jubilee ..	8
Books Condemned	102, 301
Bunbury, Patrons of Diocese	301
Holy Week, Liturgical order restored	1
Music, Encyclical on Sacred ..	95
Religious Subjects, Apostolic Constitution on training	291
Sacred Heart, Encyclical Letter <i>Haurietis aquas</i>	193

ARTICLES.

Archdeacon John McEncroe (1795-1868), IX, X (Rev. Roger Wynne)	22, 117
Basic Virtue, The (Rt. Rev. Mgr. C. Roberts, D.D.)	207
"Except it be for fornication": A suggested interpretation (Rev. Thomas Considine, M.A.)	214
Human Nature under the influence of the Supernatural (Rev. J. P. Kenny, S.J.)	11
Juridical Relationships between Parish Priests and clerical Religious, I (Rev. Thomas Connolly, D.C.L.)	302
Mary, the universal Dispenser of Graces, I, II (Rev. Augustine Regan, C.S.S.R., S.T.D.),	224, 321
Scriptural Controversy between St. Jerome and St. Augustine, The (Rev. Henry Davis, Ph.D., L.S.S.)	103
St. Jerome on the Inspiration and Inerrancy of Scripture (Rev. William Dalton, S.J.)	313

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

(Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D.)	
Doctrinal Aspects of the Sunday Forgiveness of Sins, The	332
Liturgy and Dogma, The	32
Sacrament of Baptism in the Liturgy of the Easter Vigil, The	129

MORAL THEOLOGY.

(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.)	
Bination, Condition for	46
Children of Careless Catholics	347
Communicatio in Sacris	38
Confessions, Faculties for priests'	246
Confession, Faculties for, of religious sisters	147
Contract, A qualified	251
First Communion of children of careless parents	253
Hypnosis, Morality of medical .	338
Missa pro populo, Obligation of	349
Mutilation of human body	138
Sunday Obligation and Eucharistic Fast, Questions about ..	248

CANON LAW.

(Very Rev. Mgr. G. C. Gallen, P.C., D.C.L.)	
Canon 637 and sick religious ..	257
Canon 988 and Irregularities from crime	149
Impuberes and irregularities from crime	351
Marriage, Dissolution of, in favorem fidei	48
Vagi, Marriage of	353

LITURGY.

(Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.)	
Apostolate and the Sacraments, The	163
Congregation of Rites, Some decrees	162
Liturgical Week, Australian ..	165
Mass, Prayers after	159
Patron of Church, Shrine of ..	356
Reverences to Altar	161
Sancta Maria in Sabbato	359
Saint Benedict, Medal of	357
Scapular Green, Blessing of	358
Sermons before Blessed Sacrament	161, 263
Votive Mass on First Friday ..	160
Votive Masses, Some notes on ..	55

HOMILETICS.

(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)	
Charity in Action	271
Christian Duty towards the Civil Government	361

Humility and membership of the Church	167
Sacrificial response to the mercies of God	63

NOTES.

A mid-century survey of the Bible (Rev. H. G. Davis, Ph.D., L.S.S.)	174
Before the catastrophe (Very Rev. T. Veech)	177
Notes on Archbishop Reynolds (Dom Ximenes, O.S.B.)	70
Propitiation in the sacrifice of the Old Testament (Rev. W. J. Dalton, S.J.)	76
Some Recent Books (Very Rev. T. Veech)	370
The Piltdown Forgery (Rev. Francis Mecham, M.A.)	278
Was William Bland Converted? (R. A. Daly, B.A.)	367

BOOK REVIEWS.

<i>All My Life Love</i> (Day)	148
<i>At the School of St. Therese of the Child Jesus</i> (Trans. Collins)	182
<i>Australian Liturgical Week</i>	165
<i>Being and Becoming</i> (Hawkins) ..	84
<i>Betrothal Contract in the Code of Canon Law, The</i> (Wrzaszczak) ..	287
<i>Bible To-day, The</i>	174
<i>Black Popes</i> (Roberts)	355
<i>Catch Those Little Foxes</i>	31
<i>Cessation of Delegated Power, The</i> (De Witt)	91
<i>Church and State Through the Centuries</i> (Edit. Ehler and Morrall)	191
<i>Conflict and Light</i> (Ed. Bruno) .	92
<i>Congregation of Sacred Rites, The</i> (McManus)	287
<i>Corpus Christi</i> (Mascall)	87
<i>Devil's Hunting Ground, The</i> (Blamires)	189
<i>Divine Masterpiece, The</i> (Roschini)	238
<i>Doubt in Canon Law</i> (Viau) ..	91
<i>History of Christian Philosophy</i>	

<i>in the Middle Ages</i> (Gilson) .	285
<i>I Myself Will Comfort You</i> ..	21
<i>Is the Priest at Home?</i> (Tomelty)	93
<i>Jesus in His Times</i> (Daniel-Rops)	86
<i>Legislation and Requirements for punishable cohabitation in Invalid Marriages</i> (Sullivan) ..	185
<i>Life of Christ</i> (Ricciotti)	189
<i>Listen, Sister</i> (Moffatt)	256
<i>Local Superior in Non-Exempt Clerical Congregations, The</i> (McGrath)	185
<i>Love and Violence</i>	88
<i>Meaning of Love, The</i> (Johann) ..	85
<i>Mongol Mission, The</i> (Edit. Dawson)	289
<i>Mother of God, The</i> (Philipon) ..	381
<i>Mystical Rose, The</i> (Edit. Regina)	284
<i>Mystical Theology of St. Bernard, The</i> (Gilson)	190
<i>Neglected Saints</i> (Watkin)	284
<i>New Light on the Passion</i> (O'Connell)	84
<i>Of His Fullness</i> (Vann)	262
<i>Only Son</i> (Farrell)	188
<i>Ordination to the Priesthood</i> (Bligh)	377
<i>Patristic Homilies on the Gospels, Vol. I</i> (Toal)	376
<i>Remembered in Blessing: The Courtfield Story</i>	379
<i>Saint Therese of Lisieux</i> (Morton)	89
<i>Saints and Ourselves</i> (Edit. Caraman)	337
<i>Seed that Grew, A</i> (Johnston) ..	380
<i>So Near is God</i> (Gillis)	366
<i>Sunday Sermon Outlines</i> (Connell)	191
<i>The Lord's Prayer</i> (Gregory of Nyssa, Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. XVIII (Trans. Graef)	90
<i>Two Portraits of St. Teresa of Lisieux</i> (Robo)	186
<i>Unity of Philosophical Experience, The</i> (Gilson)	183
<i>Western Dilemma, The</i> (Smith) ..	288
<i>What Catholics Believe</i> (Pieper and Raskop)	286

“B.C.” Macaroni and Spaghetti

Manufactured from highest grade Semolina.

Note: the difference when you serve “BC” brand Macaroni
and Spaghetti.



“Olio Sasso”

PURE ITALIAN OLIVE OIL
PURITY AND DELICACY UNSURPASSED

●
Olio Sasso is genuine Italian Olive Oil, made
from the finest olives, and preferred the world
over for use in cooking, in salads, or medi-
cinally.

B. Callose & Sons

Pty. Ltd.

22 CAMPBELL STREET, SYDNEY.

'PHONE MA 4630.